

# DOUGLASS' MONTHLY.

"OPEN THY MOUTH FOR THE DUMB, IN THE CAUSE OF ALL SUCH AS ARE APPOINTED TO DESTRUCTION; OPEN THY MOUTH, JUDGE RIGHTEOUSLY, AND PLEAD THE CAUSE OF THE POOR AND NEEDY."—1st Eccl. xxxi. 8, 9.

VOLUME III. }  
NUMBER VI. }

ROCHESTER, NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1860.

PRICE—  
ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM.

## CONTENTS OF THE PRESENT NUMBER.

New Trouble between Old Friends....	353, 362
The Political Abolition Convention at Worcester, Mass.....	354, 361
Jerry Celebration for 1860.....	355, 367
The American Church and Clergy the Bulwark of American Slavery.....	355
Wm. L. Yancey at Corinthian Hall.....	355
What is the Duty of Radical Abolitionists in the Present Campaign?.....	357
Hayti and Colored Emigration.....	358
Letters from the Old World.....	360
Christianity and Color.....	366
Negro Insurrection.....	366
The 'Free Negro' in Maryland.....	367
The Sacrifice.....	368
Advertisements, Obituary Notices, &c.....	363

## DOUGLASS' MONTHLY.

### NEW TROUBLE BETWEEN OLD FRIENDS.

The stone of stumbling, the rock of offence, the source which, perhaps, more than all things else, has embarrassed, rendered inefficient, and made the Radical Abolition movement a subject of ridicule and reproach at home and abroad, has been the facility with which its leading men have found occasion to *fall out by the way*, about matters that, in themselves, have no necessary connection with the great object which should bind all hearts together, and unite all energies for its accomplishment. While agreed with each other concerning the inherent sinfulness and the stupendous criminality of slavery; while united and strong in the conviction that the immediate and complete abolition of slavery is the one great and first duty of the American people; while they have labored with zeal and ability to bring this guilty nation to the same high conviction of duty, they have again and again allowed themselves to fall out by the way, and quarrel with each other about minor points, about side issues, political theories and theological dogmas, about which workers in a common cause might well agree to differ, and which should never be permitted to disturb and mar the beauty of a *great human movement* for the human well being of four millions of the human family now sunk in this land to the condition of brutes. It is too bad that this should be so. Our cause is retarded by it, and we protest against it, and every thing leading to the like diversion from the good work, which all know ought to be done, and which requires all the energies we possess to do it.

We are not shooting in the air. A controversy, which looks more than threatening, between WM. GOODELL and GERRIT SMITH—men who have worked together in the anti-slavery cause during more than a quarter of a century, and whom no Abolitionist ever expected to see separated this side of the grave—are now actually engaged in controversy, which, though polite and respectful in terms, is bitter and reproachful in the elements upon which it feeds, and must sow the seeds of estrangement not only between themselves, but between their mutual friends, who have been accustomed to look up to them for coun-

sel and example. We say, brethren, have an end to this controversy. No one doubts the orthodoxy of WM. GOODELL. No one can doubt the Abolitionism of GERRIT SMITH.—The honesty and ability of both men are beyond question. They are both Abolitionists, and agree in all the leading doctrines of the Abolition creed. We love them both. We honor them both. Grateful tears have filled our eyes when thinking of the great words and deeds which they have for years persistently brought to the service of our enslaved people. We should rejoice to see them reunited, and if not united, at least agreed to differ. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the controversy, nor push aside the duty of expressing our opinion in regard to it. The question is forced upon us; and painful as is the duty it imposes, we shall not shrink from looking it squarely in the face and taking our ground.

We were among the small band of Abolitionists, at Syracuse, who took part in the unanimous nomination of GERRIT SMITH as a candidate for the Presidency, to be supported at the ballot box, and everywhere, as a sound and trustworthy man, fit for the place for which he was named. We thought then, and think still, that we acted wisely as to the measure and the man. No man was ever nominated better known to those who nominated him. No man ever more fully represented or embodied in himself the principles and policy of those by whom he was nominated. He may be properly called the author of the leading ideas and doctrines that distinguish the Radical Abolition party.—The unconstitutionality and illegality of slavery, and the power of the Federal Government over the slave system, are his long settled and everywhere asserted views. He holds all the needful doctrines, and is in favor of the application of them to the national abolition of slavery. This is what we want, and all we want. The idea and the man are alike acceptable.

But our friend WM. GOODELL, who has heretofore been one of Mr. SMITH's strongest and ablest supporters, has now come to the conclusion that Mr. SMITH is no longer fit to receive his vote and support, and regards his nomination, as DANIEL WEBSTER said of ZACHARIAH TAYLOR, a nomination not fit to be made.

The reasons of Mr. GOODELL for withholding his vote and support from Mr. SMITH, we publish elsewhere in our present number.—We have read them with care, and we doubt not our respected readers will do the same, and they can also form their own opinion of their soundness, as we have done.

To our mind, whatever may be thought of them as sharp criticisms upon some of Mr. SMITH's opinions and frames of mind, they fall far short of justifying any genuine single-hearted Abolitionist in refusing to Mr. SMITH his vote and cordial support, for the high office to which he has been fairly and unani-

mously nominated by an honest Convention of Radical Abolitionists.

On reading Mr. GOODELL's strictures, we could but raise the inquiry: If GERRIT SMITH, with his blameless life, persistent philanthropy, and his uncompromising Abolitionism, is not fit to receive the vote and support of the Abolitionists of this country, where shall we look for another? Who in this land could we nominate, freer from objection on the score of abolition faithfulness? We are free to say, that looking over the whole field, we know of none with claims to surpass his.

When a man refuses to vote and support another for any political office, a valid foundation for such refusal cannot be found any where short of the unfitness of the candidate for the place. He must be incompetent from some cause, moral or otherwise, to fulfill the duties which the office imposes. This unfitness may be found either in the principles and doctrines of the man, or in his dishonesty.—He may be a good man, with bad political principles, or he may be a weak man, and mentally incapable of carrying out any principles consistently, good or bad. In either case we may properly refuse him our vote and support. He is not fit for the place, and therefore any party would disgrace itself, even though it had no hope of electing him, by holding such a man up to the country for such an office. Our candidate is not expected to agree with us in respect to the relative excellence of Homeopathy as against Allopathy, or Hydropathy as against Thomsonianism—for the duties of the office to which we would elect him does not require him either to decide upon medical or theological questions.—The business imposed upon the civil ruler by the American Constitution and by the Radical Abolition party, is to establish justice, and protect and secure the rights and liberties of the people.

Now, the question before us is: Has Mr. GOODELL, or any body else, demonstrated the unfitness of Mr. SMITH to discharge the high duties imposed by the Constitution of the United States, or by the abolition platform of the men who have put him in nomination?—Has he alleged against him a single fault that ought to deprive him of the vote and the cordial and zealous support of any man who honestly and earnestly wishes to see American slavery abolished by means of the Federal Government? Has he exposed any thing either in Mr. SMITH's principles or in his policy, in his life or in his spirit, which ought to deprive him of the respect and the confidence of any body, or that upon his election to the office of President, would be likely to prevent his doing all that any other man in his place could do to bring the slave system to a peaceful and speedy termination? If he has not done this, and we think he has not, he has not given any good reason for refusing to vote for, and otherwise to support his old and long tried friend for the office to which he is nominated.



Say what we will of GERRIT SMITH, America has yet to see, with all his alleged doubts, despondencies, errors and eccentricities, a higher aim, greater singleness of purpose, more unyielding tenacity to principle, more liberality in the bestowment of his means, in every good word and work, than has been displayed in the life of GERRIT SMITH—and if such a man be not worthy of our cause and our company, we do not know where to look for one who may be. The highest intellects of the country have confessed his ability, and almost the only objection to him we have ever felt the force of, is the fact that the man and his policy are too far in advance of the pride, selfishness and prejudices of the times, to command the votes of the people—an objection which Radical Abolitionists can certainly bear with at this, as well as at any former time.

Through many long and labored pages, Mr. GOODELL, in his paper, the *Principia*, brings to view what he conceives to be the unsound religious doctrines and opinions of GERRIT SMITH. To do this, is the unquestionable right of Mr. GOODELL. He, as well as GERRIT SMITH, is learned in all matters of religious controversy. Let them discuss their differences tongue-wise and pen-wise. Let WM. GOODELL criticise and combat the religious views of Mr. SMITH, with all that logical skill for which he is justly distinguished; let him summon to the aid of his orthodoxy all the resources of his extensive reading and long experience. He is the proper judge of his work, and these are his legitimate weapons; but let him not add to these legitimate means of religious proselytism one which has its basis in nothing better than religious bigotry.—When a man finds a reason for refusing to vote for another for civil office, in the fact that that man differs from him in religious opinion, he acts upon the most mischievous and dangerous principle that can possibly disturb society. Mr. GOODELL denies that he acts on any such principle; but the fact remains that he refuses to vote for Mr. SMITH, and places what he regards the heretical opinions of Mr. SMITH among his reasons. To be sure, he charges the latter with making anti-orthodoxy a criterion of political action and association. But this charge cannot stand. Mr. SMITH will vote for WM. GOODELL, the Orthodox; but WM. GOODELL will not vote for GERRIT SMITH, the anti-Orthodox. What Mr. SMITH sees fit to speak and write at Peterboro', and then publish to the world at his own expense, is his own affair. He has the same right to make converts to his creed, that WM. GOODELL has to make converts to his. Both men are free, and neither is responsible to the other for his religious creed; but when one refuses to work with the other for the abolition of slavery, because of these religious differences, Humanity steps in and says: Gentlemen, your religion is seriously interfering with your usefulness, and it is quite time to have an end to your dangerous and hurtful dispute.

To all human seeming, the prospect of emancipation to the down-trodden and bleeding bondman of this country, is dark enough. Mountain difficulties interpose their dark and frowning fronts to the triumph of Justice and Liberty, over the pride and selfishness of the dominant race. We dare not hold out hopes of an easy victory, under the most favorable

conditions. But alas! alas! for the slave, if to him can come no redemption until the religious creeds of men shall entirely conform to one standard. A deeper gloom must be added to the darkness and desolation of his fate, and the last ray of hope for peaceful emancipation extinguished.

#### THE POLITICAL ABOLITION CONVENTION AT WORCESTER, MASS.

Since our last publication, we attended a two days' Abolition Convention at Worcester, the proceedings of which may be found in our other columns. We cannot say that the Convention met all our expectations, or afforded strong encouragement that old Massachusetts will easily be aroused to the duty of voting directly for the abolition of slavery; and yet, in view of all the circumstances, the conviction of the people that they are doing about all that can at present be done against slavery by voting with the Republican party, the opposition to the new movement by the members and friends of the American Anti-Slavery Society, whose theory of the abolition of slavery it, in some sense, contradicts—the absence of several of the leading speakers, men and women, who had signified their intention to be present—the drenching rain which continued from the commencement to the close—the holding of the Convention at all—was in itself a success. Neither new principles, nor new applications of old principles, are readily perceived or adopted by the masses; all such principles and applications must have their day of small things; and happy is the man who is not ashamed of the truth in the humility of its infancy. The idea, that the Constitution of the United States is not a slaveholding instrument; that its principles, spirit and provisions are anti-slavery; that it gives ample scope and power to the Federal Government to abolish slavery; and that it is the duty of the American people so to wield that power as that slavery shall be bro't to a speedy end, is not a new idea to Abolitionists in the State of New York, but it is quite new to the masses in New England, although the ablest argument ever written in favor of that theory emanated from LYSANDER SPOONER, a citizen of Boston. Abolitionists of Massachusetts have for years taught that slavery is constitutional, and that the first duty of the free States is to separate themselves from the slave States. They have made but few converts to the last proposition, although the first is generally conceded. They have not done so for two reasons; first—people have failed to see in *dissolution* a remedy for the evil of slavery; and second—they have seen that breaking up the Union would, in all the likelihoods of the case, add civil war to the list of evils already existing.

People thus educated and prepossessed are not to be expected, especially on the eve of the election now at hand, to turn readily aside to welcome a movement at once contradicting all their established beliefs and opinions, and subversive of all their present plans of political action in respect to slavery. We, therefore, consider that the holding of the Convention in Massachusetts, at all, the steady attendance of a few good and true men and women upon all its sessions, listening to all that was said, and assenting to the principles laid down, fully compensate for the time and labor which the effort has cost. Mr.

JOSEPH A. HOWLAND, of Worcester, was the chief opponent of the principles and plans of the Convention. His ground was that of the Garrisonian party generally. He was well and happily answered by Mr. STEPHEN S. FOSTER, who was chiefly instrumental in getting up the Convention.

Mr. HOWLAND has since given a report of the Convention to the readers of the *Boston Liberator*, in which he vindicates his course in the Convention, exults in the smallness of the audience assembled, the absence of some of the speakers announced, the failure of some of the main supporters of the movement to be present, and thus pays his respects to the writer:

Mr. Douglass seemed to come quite readily into the work of the annihilation of the American A. S. Society, and in his various speeches took frequent occasion to misrepresent its character, and with his inimitable powers of sarcasm to caricature its positions and measures. At one time, in urging the support of the new movement, he said that it was the only organization that proposed the abolition of slavery.—Mr. Howland suggested the incorrectness of this assertion. In reply, Mr. Douglass said, I know that our friend thinks that the object of the American Anti-Slavery Society is the abolition of slavery, but he is mistaken—for the object of that Society is the dissolution of the American Union. To be sure they hold that the abolition of slavery will follow the dissolution of the Union, but that is a matter of opinion. In my opinion it would not.

When Mr. Douglass was through, Mr. Howland took the floor, and without attempting to make a full constitutional argument, confined himself to a brief review of some of the sophistries and falsifications of history whereon Mr. Douglass had based his constitutional argument, and took occasion to say, in sustaining the position and character of the American A. S. Society, that when Mr. Douglass asserted that the abolition of slavery was not the object or purpose of that Society, he made a false assertion, and one that he knew to be false.—Whereupon Mr. Foster called to order. The temporary Chairman told Mr. Howland that his remark was neither parliamentary nor pretty, and Mr. Douglass thought that he ought to take it back. But as Mr. Douglass showed no disposition to retract his audacious libel, Mr. Howland did not retract his characterization of it. Had Mr. Douglass simply said that, in his opinion, the position or action of the American Anti-Slavery Society could not result in the abolition of slavery, or even explained that this was what he meant in what he did say, it would have clearly appeared to be his right to hold and express this opinion, and Mr. Howland's remark would have been out of place as well as out of taste. But he did no such thing. And it is to be hoped that whenever he utters so atrocious a slander, some one will have the manliness to rebuke him with as plain Anglo-Saxon speech as Mr. Howland did on this occasion.

To say that the Republican party does not propose to abolish slavery in the slave States, is not to utter an 'atrocious slander' against that party, although it is contended by the leading members of that party, that the non-extension of slavery will lead to the abolition of slavery. To say that the American church and clergy do not propose to abolish slavery, is not to slander the church and clergy, although leading men in the pulpit do say that the spread of the gospel will abolish slavery.—To say that the dissolution of the Union will not abolish slavery, is not to slander its advocates, although they say that the slaves would free themselves if the Union were dissolved. Not wishing to be placed in a false position to the American A. S. Society, we sent the following letter to the *Liberator*:

Rochester, Oct. 15th, 1860.

MR. GARRISON:—You will oblige me by allowing me to say in your columns, that the letter of J. A. H., which appeared in the *Liberator* of September 28th, does me injustice, in the part it represents me as having taken in



the proceedings of the recent Political Abolition Convention held in Worcester. Neither Mr. Foster, nor I, undertook the formidable work which your correspondent, in his letter, ascribed to us. I beg to assure you, that the 'annihilation of the American Anti-Slavery Society' was no part of the business of the Convention. The language of your correspondent is much too strong. It conveys an exaggerated idea of what took place on the occasion which it purports to describe. Every body knows that to criticise the position of an association in respect to a single point in its plan of operation, is a very different thing from discrediting an association altogether, and working for its destruction. I plead guilty to the first, but not the last impeachment. There is no good reason for misrepresenting even an enemy, if I must be deemed such. I did freely dissent from one of your leading doctrines, and did my best to prove it unsound, but in no such spirit as would be inferred from the language of your Worcester correspondent. My objection to the American A S Society respected its PLAN—not its life. So far from working for the annihilation of that Society, I have never failed in the worst times of my controversy with it, to recognize that organization as the most efficient generator of anti-slavery sentiment in the country; and this I did, repeatedly, at Worcester. The compliment which J. A. H. pays Mr. Howland for the part he took in the Convention, is natural, perhaps—but it is scarcely modest—since the complimenter and the complimented is one and the same person. If 'manliness' consists in calling a man a LIAR to his face, or what is about the same thing, telling him he knows he tells a falsehood, I must prefer manners to 'manliness.' To me, Mr. Howland's manner and language on that occasion, and of which he now boasts in the 'Liberator,' was better becoming a slave plantation among slaves, than an anti-slavery Convention among equals.

What had I said to call forth this ill-mannered charge from Mr. Howland? Why, in substance this: that the plan of operation adopted by the American Anti-Slavery Society did not embrace the abolition of slavery by means of the Government, and that the Radical Abolition party was the only organization which proposed such abolition. This is what I said, and what I meant to say. Mr. Howland, by suppressing a part of what I did say, and adding a little that I did not say, makes out to his own satisfaction a case of falsehood against me. His zeal has, in this instance, outrun his discretion, and I leave him to retrace his steps, as I am happy to see he has had to do in the case of Mr. Higginson.

Respectfully yours,  
FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

We should have been better pleased to have seen this temperate (perhaps too temperate) reply to the statements of Mr. HOWLAND in the same columns in which those statements appeared; but since Mr. GARRISON has neither published nor acknowledged the receipt of our letter, we are glad to have retained a copy, which we could thus place on record. The ranks of genuine Abolitionists—men who really desire to effect the abolition of slavery—are quite too few and thin to court strife or division among themselves; and this sentiment was never absent from us, but manifest in all we said at Worcester—Mr. HOWLAND to the contrary notwithstanding.

#### JERRY CELEBRATION FOR 1860.

This anniversary was better celebrated this year than for several years previously, and must have cheered the hearts of the friends of the slave who attended it. The resolutions adopted on the occasion are published in our present number. They were drawn up by Mr. C. D. MILLS, of Syracuse. They speak for themselves. The Annual Address, for any part of which we regret that we are unable to find room in our present number, was prepared and read by Rev. SAMUEL J. MAY. It is the amplest vindication of the Jerry Rescue, and of the principles involved in that memorable uprising against the fiendish and

brutal conduct of our slaveholding and slave-hunting Government, ever yet presented and adopted in one paper. In listening to it we were rather surprised that so much could be said in vindication of that praiseworthy transaction. A long argument to show that to give a crust of bread to a starving man, a cup of cold water to a thirsty man, to extinguish the flames of our neighbor's dwelling, or to rescue a babe from the jaws of a bull dog, who was tearing its living flesh to pieces with his terrible teeth, an innocent and praiseworthy deed, would be a literary curiosity. Yet no more innocent, no more praiseworthy are any of these, than was the act of snatching Jerry out of the teeth of the human hounds, in Syracuse, nine years ago.—So, too, it would be viewed throughout the country, if slavery had not eaten out the hearts, and blinded the minds of the American people, to an extent at which future generations will be astonished and incredulous.—Some such remark as this we ventured to make, concerning the address of Mr. MAY, at the time, but with no purpose to disparage the Address. The paper is wisely adapted to answer the popular objections to the rescue of Jerry, and is therefore worthy of all commendation. Among the speakers on the occasion, were Rev. S. J. MAY, Rev. Mr. THOME, of early anti-slavery fame, the veteran BERTHA GREEN, and FREDERICK DOUGLASS. Mr. GREEN was more than ever alive on this occasion.—He seemed to be rejuvenated, and loomed out with amazing eloquence and power. The whole moral or immoral structure of the Republican party was exhibited with a master hand, and the duty of occupying Radical Abolition ground was made plain to the blindest. The meeting took care to provide for the tenth anniversary, and we doubt not that these anniversaries will grow in interest and in favor with Abolitionists from year to year, so long as the existence of slavery in the country shall make such demonstrations necessary.

THE AMERICAN CHURCH AND CLERGY THE BULWARK OF AMERICAN SLAVERY.—Experience continues to demonstrate the entire emptiness and worthlessness of American religion.—Among the latest proofs of its hollowness, are the proceedings of the Episcopal Convention, recently held in the city of New York, and the very similar proceedings of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, held at Boston. Both these mighty representatives of American Christianity have utterly refused to commit their members against even the African slave trade, although formally pressed to do so by an eminent member of each body. We had intended to lay the proceedings of both these important religious bodies before our readers in the present number, with much other interesting matter, respecting the recent conviction and imprisonment, at Chicago, of JOHN HOSSACK, for the crime of rescuing a slave out of the hands of an official kidnapper; but we are prevented by the pressure of other matter upon our columns.

That wickedly pious journal, the New York Observer, the editor of which has recently been enlightening the evangelical public respecting the 'POWER OF PRAYER,' thus exults over the prompt and emphatic manner in which the subject of slavery was suppressed and given the go-by in these two grand evangelical Conventions. It flings a strong light on the pro-slavery spirit of the American churches generally. We beg especially our British readers to note these brief paragraphs:

'Place was not given, even for an hour, [at the last meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions,] to the exciting subject of slavery. It is many years since the Board has been allowed to attend to its appropriate work with so little interruption from this source. An effort was made by a single individual, in two or three different forms, to obtain some action on the subject of the slave trade, but it was promptly put down, and that, too, at the instance of the same persons who, for two or three years past, have sought to introduce the subject into the American Tract Society, when it has met to attend to the business of its anniversaries. We regard this as ominous for good, not only to the American Board, but to our other religious institutions. May they all be permitted to prosecute their work with as little interruption.'

'John Jay, Esq., made the usual annual and futile effort to force the subject of slavery into the [Diocesan] Convention. The summary manner in which he was disposed of, while it rebuked his folly, was a prompt vindication of the dignity and high conservative and religious character of this body of Christian laymen and clergymen.'

#### WM. L. YANCEY AT CORINTHIAN HALL.

The first thought that struck us on the appearance of this eloquent defender of slavery, in Rochester, was the superlative impudence which could prompt such a man to come here on such a mission. The right of speech is a most sacred right, and one which we hope never to see cloven down in Rochester, or in any free State of the American Union. Yet, he who claims and exercises that right in Rochester, and at the same time tramples upon that right elsewhere, and glories in the tyranny, adds impudence to oppression.—Every body knows that a Rochester man, who should dare to call slavery in question, expose its evils, and lecture the people of Alabama on their duty to abolish the system, could not live on the soil of that State a single hour. The doctrine and practice of that State is death, instant death, or expatriation to any and all who dare to question the right of slavery. Tar and feathers, rail and rope, committee and mob, stake and fire are all ready for such intruders on the domains of Alabama, and those of all the cotton States of the Union. Neither law nor gospel can protect from the savage ferocity of the mob. Scarcely a paper comes to us from the South but contains accounts of brutal, bloody and lawless proceedings against some American citizen, suspected of entertaining opinions or prejudices against slavery. Yet in the face of these violent and every where approved violations of the Constitution, these high-handed proceedings against the just and acknowledged constitutional rights of American citizens in that quarter of the country, such men as YANCEY, who, when at home, are 'head devils' in these lawless proceedings—come to Rochester, mount the rostrum in Corinthian Hall, exhibit the beauties of working men without wages, degrading persons to property, and selling men in the market. YANCEY does this, and worse. He lectures the citizens upon their duty to help hold and catch the slave—boasts of the superior guaranties given to slave property over all other property, and brands the Northern people with treason to the Constitution and the laws, if they refuse to respect, extend and protect the slave system. He puts slavery above all law, human and divine, tramples upon the right of speech at home, and then comes to Rochester to ridicule the 'Higher Law,' and to make mouths at the morals of the Northern people! If this be not superlative



impudence, we know not where to look for it. Nothing but the well known prevalence of prejudice against the race enslaved, and the long subjection of the Northern people to the insolent domination of the slaveholders of the country, can explain the presumption of this visit of YANCEY to Rochester. He knows well enough that no man need be afraid, in any part of this country, to pour contempt upon the negro; that there is always an ignorant mob, made up of all nations, who are ever mean and base enough to insult those who have no means of redress. Like slaveholders, they can flog a man when his hands are tied, and boast of their bravery. They can insult a man who is fettered by the overwhelming force of popular prejudice, when they dare not look an honest man in the face who has a chance of defence equal to themselves. It requires no courage, only baseness, to insult a negro in any part of America; and wherever Mr. YANCEY may go, he will be sure to find this quality in abundance among his democratic brethren. He evidently presumed upon its existence in large measure here in Rochester. His references to the black race, and 'greasy' descriptions of them, disclosed his impressions at this point. For the credit of Rochester, we were glad to notice that these vulgar flings at the black race were received with approval only from a few whiskey-drinking Irishmen, who were honored with places among the officers of the meeting. The great mass of the audience, attracted by curiosity to hear what the noted 'fire-eater' would say, and how he would say it, were respectable and intelligent men, who could not be induced to stoop to the meanness and mud-scow baseness of flinging mud in the faces of a people whose only crime is that they are overpowered by numbers and subjected to slavery.

Mr. YANCEY added nothing to the argument for slavery. It was the same old argument (but, we admit, presented with marked ability,) that slaves are property; that the fathers of the Republic so regarded them; that the Constitution so regards them; and that no citizen has any right to appeal to any law, or morality, higher than the Constitution, on the subject of slavery; that the Declaration of Independence only declared all white men 'free and equal'; that the Constitution of the United States was only meant to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty to white men; that the men who made the Constitution were slaveholders; that they protected the slave trade for twenty years; that they gave a three-fifths representation in slaves, and stipulated for the recapture and return of fugitive slaves.

His justification of slavery was, that the negroes are an inferior race; that they are well fed and clothed, and are better off in slavery than they were in Africa; that the negro is lazy, and will not work in a warm climate without a master to make him work; that emancipation had been a failure in the West Indies; that emancipation at the South would drive all the negroes to the North, and bring down the wages of the laboring white men here; that this would create aversion to them, and tend to legislation, driving the negro from the free States, and counter legislation by the slave States; and that the miserable people would be kicked to death between the two sections, each wishing to get rid of them;—he, therefore, urged that they

had better let things remain as they are—let well enough alone.

There was not a point presented by Mr. YANCEY which we could not have answered, and answered triumphantly upon the spot.—We should have attempted it, and might have been sustained in doing so by the audience there assembled, but for respect for the great right of peaceable assembly. The meeting was not a meeting for free debate, but for an address from Mr. YANCEY. He and his friends engaged, rented and paid for the Hall, to enable him to speak, and we to hear. We were not asked there as a speaker, but as a listener. We accepted the terms, and went to the meeting, and were bound to conform to the conditions upon which we, in common with others, were invited. No reader of ours needs an answer to any of the positions taken by Mr. YANCEY. His constitutional argument has been refuted over and over again a thousand times, and negro inferiority has been shown to be like the inferiority of all enslaved and uncultivated races, *temporary*. That the negro, like all other varieties of the human family, is subject to the great law of progress and improvement, has often been demonstrated in these columns. Mr. YANCEY and his slaveholding fraternity all know it well.—Hence they will not allow negroes to congregate in any number, without the presence of a slaveholder; hence they will not allow them to listen to political discussions of any kind; hence they are ever careful to dam up every possible avenue of knowledge whereby the slave might become intelligent; hence they make it a crime to teach a slave to read; and hence they repress every upward tendency of the race. They don't make laws to prevent their horses and cattle from learning to read. They know that a colt is not likely to turn school master; and they know equally well that the negro may do so. Their laws against the education of the negro is the best answer that can be given to the charge of inferiority and incapacity against him.

About the most bare-faced point of deception presented by Mr. YANCEY, was the pretense that the slaves are protected by the laws against the cruelty and brutality of their masters. He knows that no slave can institute legal proceedings, or testify against any white man in any court at the South, for any cause whatever, and that, therefore, all such laws are a mockery. Laws against theft and robbery, which can be appealed to by thieves and robbers, only would be laughable protection to the property of honest men; and laws for the protection of slaves, under which only slaveholders can prosecute, are alike efficient and useful. Yet when this point was urged, it was easy to see that it made a favorable impression for the speaker and his cause.—After all, however, we are glad that the people of Rochester have heard Mr. YANCEY.—He has made the ablest argument for slavery ever made here; and though it has doubtless confirmed the prejudices of the ignorant few, it has impressed the many who heard it, with utter worthlessness of all arguments brought to sustain irresponsible power by one man over the liberty and person of another. For one thing, we have reason to be obliged to Mr. YANCEY, and that is, for his most eloquent assertion of the right of an oppressed people, when under the heels of tyranny, to rise and strike down their oppressors at all hazards. This

he said in regard to the slaveholders as against the North; but the principle is far stronger for the slaves as against their guilty masters, and may some day be acted upon by them. His whole peroration might have been properly delivered on any anti-slavery platform, and applauded for its sublime assertion of the sacred right of the weak against the strong, the few against the many, the oppressed against the oppressor, and of consequence the slave against his master. It was a complete answer to all he had said during an hour and a half before.

**EQUAL SUFFRAGE.**—The movement in favor of 'Equal Suffrage' in this State is almost exclusively in the hands of the colored people themselves. Neither Republicans nor Abolitionists seem to care much for it. If we succeed in repealing the odious and unjust imposition of a property qualification upon us, we shall be more indebted, we fear, to the supineness of our enemies, than to the activity and zeal of our friends. A few only of the latter appear to give any attention to the subject; but we earnestly hope that ON THE DAY OF ELECTION, SOME TRUE MAN WILL BE FOUND, FROM SUNRISE TO SUNSET, STANDING AT EVERY POLL IN THE STATE, WITH A FULL SUPPLY OF TICKETS IN FAVOR OF EQUAL SUFFRAGE, URGING EVERY BODY TO VOTE ON THE SIDE OF JUSTICE AND LIBERTY. It is quite time that this great wrong should be blotted from the Constitution of this great and free State, too great, we trust, to oppress even the weakest of her citizens. Read the Address on this subject, which we send out in the present number, and act upon its principles and suggestions.

**THE STATE ELECTIONS.**—The Republicans have made a clean sweep of all the Northern States who have up to this time voted for State officers. Pennsylvania and Indiana, heretofore the strongholds of Democracy, have gone Republican by tremendous majorities, as will be seen from the following figures:

Maine.....	16 000	Rep. maj.
Vermont.....	20 000	" "
Pennsylvania.....	32,000	" "
Indiana.....	15 000	" "
Ohio.....	20 000	" "

The Republicans will gain by these elections two U. S. Senators—one from Pennsylvania, and the other from Indiana. From present appearances, we should judge that Abraham Lincoln will be our next President.

**TWO FREE NEGROES KIDNAPPED.**—Mr. B. M. Lynch, slave merchant at Fifth and Elm streets, yesterday morning received a telegraphic dispatch from St. Joseph, requesting him to cause the arrest of three men and a woman who had two negroes in charge, kidnapped by them. Mr. Lynch was almost simultaneously waited upon by two of the men whom the dispatch described, and who proposed to sell to him a negro lad of 21 and a girl of 17 years. After some inquiry he learned that the property was at the Great Western Hotel, at Seventeenth street and Franklin avenue. Mr. Lynch's partner induced the two men to accompany him to the City Hall, and there gave them into the custody of the police. Their names are N. B. Beck and Joel Wildey.

On the person of Beck was found a bill of sale—real or ostensible of the negroes Henry and Maria Gardner, for \$1,800, to Beck, Wildey, and Jacob Herd; the bill dated 'St. Joseph, Mo., Sept. 24,' signed 'John Rose,' and witnessed by 'James Lester.' There was also a letter from Herd, stating that he would meet the others in St. Louis.

The negroes were found at the hotel, and also a wagon and pair of horses belonging to the party.—*St. Louis Democrat.*



# WHAT IS THE DUTY OF RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS IN THE PRESENT CAMPAIGN?

## REPLY TO 'A. P.'—NO. II.

FRIEND DOUGLASS:—I have no wish 'to prolong this discussion' for the sake of discussion, or for the sake of having the last word. It seems to me, it involves the vital principles upon which the anti-slavery cause is based. If we are not to drift with the current, and go back to the old Whig doctrine of choosing '*the least of two evils*,' it seems important that a few, at least, should bear aloft the standard of unceasing and uncompromising hostility to the towering iniquity of our land.

Our friend 'A. P.' says:

'We maintained that its masses were acting from an impulse of hatred to slavery, . . . and could possibly be educated into a genuine anti-slavery power.'

I have no disposition to underrate the generous 'impulses' of the 'masses,' or the manly virtues and heroic utterances of the Sumners and Lovejoys. I simply maintain that the activities of the 'masses' are not wisely directed, and our friend does not regard them in their present attitude as '*a genuine anti-slavery power*.' How are they to be educated? By swinging our caps, and shouting, with them, 'long live Lincoln?' or by standing on a higher plane, and saying to them, 'come up hither?'

I think it is perfectly fair and right to form 'an estimate of the position and animating impulse of a great party,' from the public speeches of its acknowledged leaders. If, 'in view of local circumstances,' they ignore the rights of the slave, and deny the right of suffrage to the colored man, no amount of 'radical anti-slavery sentiments' uttered by Sumner or Lovejoy (to whom be all honor) can be put in as an 'offset.' Besides, both Sumner and Lovejoy are in bad odor with the Republican *wire pullers*. They are looked upon as 'fanatics.' Probably they could not have gotten ten votes in the Chicago Convention as Republican standard bearers, simply on account of their high-toned speeches. A man cannot advocate drunkenness 'in view of local circumstances,' and some where else plead for temperance as an 'offset.' As well might we serve the Devil to-day, and 'offset' the crime by being pious to-morrow.

'A. P.' says:

'The Republican party occupies the same general position on the slavery question, as that occupied by the Liberty Party in '44.'

In '44 there was no Fugitive Slave Law to be executed. The Liberty Party then advocated negro suffrage, the abolition of slavery in the District of C., and the abolition of the inter-State slave trade. What created the Liberty Party, and brought it to its present standard? The labors of the Abolitionists. What will elevate the people to radical anti-slavery?—The same instrumentalities, if as faithfully, perseveringly and unremittingly put forth.—Does 'A. P.' want us to *advance backward* sixteen years, for the sake of accomplishing a 'partial good?'

The anti-slavery reform, like all other reforms, is progressive in its very nature. In the progress of the cause, new applications of the truth upon which it is based, are constantly unfolded.

'New occasions teach new duties,  
Time makes ancient good uncouth,  
They must upward still, and onward,  
Who would keep abreast of Truth.'

'A. P.' seeks to find 'full license to the reign of Republican philosophy' by my 'fatal concession,' as he terms it. Radical Abolitionists contend that no man should go in favor of actual wrong, for the sake of securing any hypothetical good. On the question of human bondage, they have always contended that he should go the 'farthest verge of ideal right,' politically, socially and religiously.

There are many questions pertaining to Government besides the foundation stone—personal liberty. The tariff, postal arrangements, national treaties, internal improvements, education, agriculture. On such questions as these, which are of no value while human rights are withheld, a difference of opinion has been tolerated. Between all these 'great interests' (as the Whigs used to call them) and American slavery, there is a gulf as wide as that which separated Dives from Lazarus; and here the Radicals have urged every man to honor his highest convictions.

One fault in our friend's 'road' which he is so anxious to travel awhile, and by and by 'jump off,' (to the great danger of breaking his limbs,) consists in the fact that it lies right across the Underground Railroad. Collisions must therefore ensue, and, 'on the side of the oppressor is power.'

My complaint against the Republican party is, that AS A PARTY they do not preach genuine anti-slavery at all. Would that they preached it, even of 'envy.'

Slavery in the Carolinas is either constitutional or unconstitutional. If the former, then the only consistent ground is to say with Garrison, 'down with the Constitution.' If the latter, then you are bound to abolish it.—The Republicans can take which horn they please. I have no desire to do them 'injustice,' or get up 'false issues.'

'A. P.' claims that

'The question between them . . . is one of powers and measures, instead of one of principle and moral right.'

The simple effort to abolish slavery by 'unfriendly legislation,' (and I do not clearly comprehend what he means by that term,) by keeping slavery from entering the Territories, does in itself considered, involve no 'moral principle;' but there are *terms and conditions* annexed, which you must accept, in order to get the power to wield this 'unfriendly legislation.'

The Devil takes the Republican party 'up into an exceedingly high mountain,' showing it the White House, all the fat offices in the land, and the broad spread Territories in the dim distance, saying, 'all these will I give thee' if thou wilt execute the Fugitive Slave Law, and keep the slave in his chains. It's a bargain, says the *party*; and the 'masses,' with their 'nebulous anti-slavery impulses,' cry amen! and some of our old Radical guard echo the same.

'A. P.' says:

'Nor is it correct to say that the Republican party pledges the whole force of the Government to put down a slave-rising. They regard the Government as having been so pledged by the Constitution long before their existence as a party, and when they could not control the matter; and believing that all such risings retard, rather than advance the cause of freedom, they seek what they regard as a more safe and speedy exodus for the slave through peaceful channels.'

Here is a *distinction* without a difference. 'They could not control the matter.' Why should they desire to, since they deem it a wise provision? I think 'A. P.' uses lan-

guage very loosely when he talks about 'starving out slavery.' I do not understand how it is to be done. The present Slave States already embrace within their limits about 4,000,000 slaves. They are capable of supporting that number twice two fold. Admit that to be the maximum. There they are. The Territories are free; but what then? There they must REMAIN by Republican party philosophy, for all 'slave-risings' must be put down, because they 'retard the cause of freedom.'

I cannot agree with my friend that the 'American people cannot be moved by the sublime philosophy of Radical Abolitionists.' Has any other reform ever made such rapid progress as this in twenty-five years? We search the page of history in vain for a parallel. We must remember that the *crisis* is the greatest the world ever saw, and by it our morality was eaten out, our sympathies paralyzed, and our religion turned into a lie.

I do not regard the men who claim the Pilgrims for their fathers, and revolutionary heroes as their sires, such 'BABES' as 'A. P.' would have us believe them to be. 'Babes' or men, our business is to give free utterance to the highest convictions of our souls, and to let those convictions be exemplified in all the activities of life.

After 'A. P.'s' able defence of the Republican party, I am not at all 'shocked' to hear him say that he would 'help pirates to do good;' but I was a little disappointed at his readiness to 'give the Devil his biggest loaf of bread, when he was not willing to go over more than HALF of the parish.' I think it would have been better for him to save his big loaves and distribute them to the other half. However, it is in keeping with Republican philosophy, which goes over only HALF of the anti-slavery parish, and our friend throws in bread, body, bones, and all.

It seems to me that this whole question lies in the compass of a nut shell. If there is any significance or moral responsibility attaching to a vote, the man who votes for the candidates of the Republican party votes for the return of fugitive slaves—votes for slavery in the District of Columbia—votes to keep the slaves in the States in bondage during the pleasure of their masters—votes against negro suffrage—in short, votes that 'black men have no rights which white men are bound to respect.'

I am a slave. A Republican approaches me with a bland smile, and in a patronizing tone says: 'We will not allow your master to carry you into the Territories.—Those we reserve for white men. Now you just remain quiet where you are. If you run away, the Constitution compels us to return you to your master. Now don't run away. Perhaps you have heard of Garibaldi. He is away off in Italy. It would not be right for you here, in free America, to do what he does in those old monarchies. It would "retard your peaceful emancipation." Besides, the Constitution binds us to shoot you if you do as Garibaldi does. Now be patient, won't you? We are going to "hem in slavery and starve it out." Oh! what a debt of gratitude is laid upon my shoulders; it fairly weighs me down.'

It is an easy matter to *sneer* at the Syracuse Convention and the Radicals. They can afford to be ridiculed. At one time the



disciples all fled, but truth survived nevertheless. It is better to do 'nothing,' than to do wrong, and the man who maintains his integrity, does more than he who 'votes for a *partial good*.' There are times in the world's history in which men are commanded to 'STAND STILL and see the salvation of God.'

J. C. H.

#### REPLY TO C. A. H.

MR. EDITOR:—I have no desire to prolong the discussion which has sprung up in your columns; but as Mr. Charles A. Hammond might feel badly treated if I did not notice his sententious charges of sophistry made against me, and made with such a refreshing air of 'finality,' I have decided to say a few words which shall conclude this discussion on my part.

It is perhaps quite natural that Mr. Hammond should perceive some difficulty in the way of answering my arguments; but the cool impudence of giving the authority of his distinguished friend for saying that 'no man could answer and expose the tissue of sophistries contained in that article, better than the author of it,' is quite refreshing. This habit of borrowing insulting remarks from others, when your own supply of that sort of literature is exhausted, with which to meet the arguments of an opponent, may prove that a man is a Radical, but will scarcely suffice to elucidate the subject in debate.

Mr. Hammond's first charge upon my article is as follows:

'Perhaps the most dangerous, because the most ensnaring, is the assumption that in voting for Abraham Lincoln, Abolitionists simply aid the Republicans in limiting slavery, without being in any manner responsible for the *WRONG THINGS* which the candidate or the party may do.'

Now, if my reviewer had only seen fit to come down to plain *fact*, and stated where and when I ever put forth any such doctrine as the above, it would have aided plain common sense people to determine as to the soundness of my position. But as he does not do this, and as no such position was ever taken by me, it will be necessary to state the substance of what I did say on that point. My article did not concede that the Republican party proposed to do any 'wrong,' but that it proposes to do much good, but not all the good which the Radicals ask to have done.—In doing good, it proposes to go to the verge of its constitutional power of political action, and then to bring to bear its *moral power* against slavery even beyond the limits of its constitutional political action. It does not propose to create or support slavery in the States, but to let it alone politically, because compelled so to do by its understanding of the Constitution. Most men of Mr. Hammond's age will be able to see the difference between this position and that of proposing to do a positive wrong. I am morally bound to use my influence against profane swearing. I have a right to *enforce* the abstaining from oaths in my own family; and when I have done that, and used my *moral* influence against the habit in my neighbor's family, if Mr. Hammond should charge me with supporting all the swearing in the neighborhood, because I did not administer *birch* discipline to my neighbor's boys, and I should reply, I do all I can by authority at home and by moral influence abroad, to correct this bad practice; but I have no legal right to set up authority in the case beyond my own family

circle—if he could not see the logical difference between that position and the position of sanctioning the 'wrong' of swearing, or doing that wrong myself, I should regard his radicalism as a little too much sublimated to to be reasoned with. He reminds me of the M. D. who was called to see a patient, and after feeling his pulse, and walking around his bed for some time, he confessed that he did not understand the case or know where the disease was located; 'but,' said he, 'I'll tell you what it is. I'll give him a dose that will throw him into *fits*, and then I can cure him—for *I'm death on fits*.' So Mr. Hammond seems to have been unable to find the seat of the difficulty in my *real* position, and resorts to misrepresentation to throw that position 'into fits,' and then shows that he is 'death on fits.'

Mr. Hammond's next 'lunge' is to charge Mr. Lincoln with being a 'slave-catching' President, in the event of his election. That Mr. Lincoln has said that he was not pledged to the 'UNCONDITIONAL' repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law, is true; but that it is to be inferred from this that he would be a slave-catching President, is 'a most lame and impotent conclusion.' I am not in favor of the 'UNCONDITIONAL' repeal of the present liquor law; but I consider it a very shabby law nevertheless. I understand Mr. Lincoln to be in favor of a law that shall leave this question of returning fugitive slaves or not to the States into which the fugitive may escape; and I believe that such a disposition of the fugitive question would be eminently safe for the slave. Republicans never did 'seize and restore fugitives to slavery;' but on the contrary, have often rescued them from the grip of the slave-catcher. Those who rescued Jerry were, a large majority of them, Republicans. The Oberlin rescuers were all Republicans, and were backed up by the Republican party of Ohio, with Mr. Giddings at its head. The rescuers of Nalle were Republicans, and the only places in all the North where a fugitive could be 'seized and taken back to slavery,' are the few cottonized cities where the Republicans are in a minority. These facts are worth infinitely more than all the extracts from stump speeches made under the screens of a local political exigency ever delivered, as evidence of the real position of the Republicans on slave-catching. They are not quite so brave as the Radicals in *resolutions*; but in the Jerry case they *ACTED*, while the Radicals were in that secret meeting laying plans, and the Free Soil shout, as Jerry was brought forth, broke up the plan-laying meeting of the Radicals.

Mr. Hammond says Mr. Lincoln would suppress a slave insurrection, and that Mr. Smith would interfere to help the slaves. Mr. H. must have been too far from Peterboro' for consultation, when he wrote that sentence.—Mr. Smith commenced a libel suit a few months ago against a committee who charged him with favoring a slave insurrection, laying his damages at \$50,000! Mr. Hammond must have received some new light recently, or else he has no authority to say that Mr. Smith would help the slaves in such an insurrection. Mr. Smith charges that this statement is a libel when printed in the New York *Herald*; and if it be a libel to say he favors an insurrection, who has a right to say that he would take sides with the insurrectionists?

Mr. Hammond says Mr. Lincoln would receive new slave States. Mr. Lincoln himself, speaking on that point, says: 'We (the Republicans) insist on the policy that shall restrict it (slavery) to its present limits.' He says also in his debate with Douglas, 'I am impliedly, if not expressly pledged to a belief in the *right* and the *duty* of Congress to prohibit slavery in all the United States Territories.' If this is not a pledge to oppose the admission of new slave States, what would satisfy C. A. H. on that point? Does he like the position of his own candidate better, as it is defined in his speech in Congress, June 27, 1854, where he says:

'Let Cuba come to us if she wishes to come. She belongs to us by force of her geographical position. Let her come even if she shall not abolish her slavery. I am willing to risk the subjection of her slavery to a common fate with our own. Slavery must be short lived in this land.'

Now I do not like to call this 'fillibustering' after new slave territory, but I think it quite proper mildly to limit to the friends of a candidate who stands on the record thus, that they should be a little modest about charging Mr. Lincoln with being in favor of admitting new slave States. Rather too much glass in the roof of the political house which now shelters you, friend Hammond, for it to be very safe or judicious for you to throw stones! It would be very unjust to call Mr. Smith a 'tool of the slave power,' for uttering the above sentiment, although it commits him to the most odious and ultra measure put forth by the slave power during the last ten years. And I suggest to Mr. C. A. H. that he should be a little modest in applying such language to Mr. Lincoln, especially while Mr. Lincoln is opposed to the acquisition of more slave territory, and his candidate Mr. Smith seeks such addition.

Mr. Hammond winds up his communication by the authoritative declaration that my 'illustrations are wide of the mark!' The *ipsi dixit* of Mr. Hammond must be conclusive, and so the discussion may be brought to a conclusion.

A. PRYNE.

#### HAYTI AND COLORED EMIGRATION.

Translated for Douglass' Monthly from the *Haytian Moniteur*, official organ of Geffard's Government, by JAMES REDPATH.

#### AN IMPORTANT DOCUMENT.

OFFICE OF THE SECY OF STATE OF THE INTERIOR AND OF AGRICULTURE, SECTION OF THE INTERIOR {  
REPORT.

To his Excellency the President of Hayti.

PRESIDENT:—I believe the time has come to submit to your Excellency the result of labors undertaken by your order on the question of Emigration into our country of men of our race. After having examined, under different points of view, this important subject, it is time to substitute action for preliminary studies, and the more that definitive questions are now proposed to the Government of the Republic. Men who have appreciated the riches of our soil, the mildness of our national manners, the workings of our institutions, the good intention of your Excellency, desire to put their hand to the work. Direct propositions have been addressed to us; demands for information have been made of us; time presses; they ought to be replied to.

On the other hand, we ought to state that in all that portion of our hemisphere, which extends from the rivers St. Lawrence to Orinoco, a work of expulsion is in progress, to



which we ought not to remain inattentive. To profit by this movement in welcoming men of our blood, the victims of these outrageous persecutions, is to continue the work of reformation undertaken by the founders of the Republic, and to remain faithful to the national traditions.

I will firstly exhibit what has been done by my predecessors and by myself to advance this question to a practical result; and then I will submit to your Excellency the conclusions which it seems to me proper to adopt.

On the 22d of August, 1859, the Government, by a circular of the Secretary of State of the Interior and of Agriculture, made an appeal to all persons of our race who suffer from the prejudice of color. Hayti offers them a refuge and facilities to come and establish themselves among us. To agriculturists, particularly, they guarantee an immediate position, in harmony with their pecuniary position. They may become landed proprietors, farmers, or laborers on half (a moiety fruits) or by the week. Those among them who had not the means of paying their passage, would be received at the expense of the Government.

It was stated that the immigrants would be excused from military service—the service of the National Guard alone being obligatory on all citizens.

Convinced of the importance of informing families who desired to come to our country of the liberality of our institutions in matters of religious belief, the Government guaranteed, conformably with the disposition of our laws, the public exercise of the worship that each of them professed.

This appeal was received abroad with numerous commendations, emanating as well from those who were themselves interested, as from the friends of humanity. It increased the honorable position of the Government, which enabled us to throw afar off a ray of civilization.

But this, the first step made by our Government, was only a general enunciation of generous intentions. Subsequent relations with men well disposed have called our attention to points of detail which it was useful to examine, and to which it became necessary to give precise replies.

The Government declares, first of all, that an absolute submission to the laws of the country was the chief of conditions. Liberal and republican, these laws offer serious guarantees to all. They satisfy, as well in civil as political order, all the legitimate wants of an advanced society. In making known its dispositions, it was in reply to questions proposed; (meanwhile all the points of detail were not examined;) they were enlightened. Our interior state is little known abroad; we judged it necessary to dissipate all doubts which might exist in the minds of foreigners.

Thus the Government said that it possessed in all parts of the country demesne lands in large tracts; that, among them, there was found lands of excellent quality; and that the laws authorized us to sell them;

That the price of them was moderate;

That, at different points, the extent was so great that groups of a hundred to two hundred families would be able to establish themselves thereon;

That to each of these groups sites would be granted, a title guaranteed for the establish-

ment of schools and chapels, whatever might be the religious belief of the members of the settlements;

That, on their declaration of intention to become Haytians and renounce all other nationalities, the emigrants would have the right of purchasing lands;

That, to honest laborers, vigorous but poor, who might not be in a position to purchase, it would give all desirable facilities for obtaining remunerative work, either as farmers, as interested on shares, (that is, paying one half the crop as rent for the farm, houses and manufactories,) or as day laborers; work of which the profit would enable them in a short time, if men of economy and good conduct, to become proprietors;

That, further, the public treasury would pay the passage of this class of persons, at the rate of nineteen piasters (American dollars) for each adult man and woman, and of eight piasters for each child of less than twelve years of age or aged persons over sixty;

That all the immunities which other citizens of the Republic enjoy will be accorded to them after a residence of one year in the Republic;

That the exercise of all religions was protected by our laws, and that our national manners guaranteed an unlimited tolerance to all beliefs;

That the formation of commercial companies, existing in other countries, was authorized by our laws; that these laws recognized societies with a collective name, without the necessity of preliminary authorization—anonymous societies with the approbation of the statutes by the Government;

That under the empire of this legislation, companies might be formed, as well for the exploration of mines or forests, as the establishment of manufactures;

That we have no patent-right laws, but that the principle exists in our civil law, and is capable of expansion;

That the Government cannot engage itself to encourage, by a protective tariff, articles which might be manufactured in Hayti; but that manufacturers would find a sufficient guarantee in our actual tariff, which has always averaged twenty per cent. on the purchase value. As our fiscal Legislature derives its chief revenues from Custom House duties, it is not likely that it will for some time to come abandon this system;

That, the chief articles of food being always abundant, there is no necessity for emigrants bringing provisions from abroad, and consequently waving the payment of Custom House duties thereon; but that machines, agricultural implements, useful effects, shall be free of entry;

That, as to the exportation of products, no change will be made in the present Custom House duties;

That the cordial reception given at St. Marc to the Louisiana emigrants by our people, so naturally hospitable, was a proof of the cordial reception in reserve for those who may subsequently arrive;

That nothing shall contravene the religious scruples of those who regard it as a duty to abstain from all occupation on the Sabbath. It is proper to state, however, that the monthly review of the National Guard has been held on the first Sunday of the month; but it will be easy to make a legal modification of this arrangement;

That a temporary lodging, for the first eight days, shall be offered to those arriving, while waiting or travelling to their destination;

That independently of the schools that these new citizens may create, the existing Government, which occupies itself, without ceasing, with the care of public instruction, has founded, and will still found numerous establishments of education, in which the monthly charges are next to nothing and gratuitous to the poor;

That our laws deprive no one of the right of quitting the country when they see fit; yet that the Haytian who deserts his country in the time of need, loses forever his quality of citizen. The emigrants who may not desire to remain in Hayti will be at liberty to re-embark; but those whose introduction into the country shall have been at public cost, shall not be permitted to leave until after three years residence, or until they repay the expenses which they occasioned to the Government.

The Government would not have regarded this task as complete, if it had not collected the most circumstantial facts on every point relating to this grave question. After receiving the order of your Excellency, I addressed, on the 20th of March last, a circular to the Commander of the Arrondissements and the Councils of the Communes, instructing them to inform all the population of the country of the condition of men of the African race abroad, and to ask from them an energetic co-operation, in the event that a great number of persons should resolve to take up their abode in Hayti. These circulars have been made public, and the responses they have called forth testify the most lively sentiments of fraternity. Extending to the administration of finances, in their capacity of managers of the national domaine, this correspondence, which has been carried on rapidly, and of which it is only possible, President, to submit to you a synopsis, has given us proof of a general good will. Here there are offers of public subscriptions; there they wish to charge themselves with the care of a certain number of persons; in an infinity of places they will give (rent) lands on halves; some will rent, others sell them; in fine, all are disposed to make all proper arrangements.

The Report then proceeds to give, arrondissement by arrondissement, (there are twenty arrondissements or counties in Hayti,) a brief statement of the vacant public or private estates, which can be bought, leased or worked on shares; from which we judge that at least 50,000 persons could be immediately domiciled in Hayti. It speaks also of the eagerness with which the public officers and influential citizens hail the project of the Government of making Hayti the chosen land the colored race. Without a good map, however, (and there is no accurate map of Hayti published in the U. S.) or without accompanying geographical details, which would unduly lengthen this article, this part of the report would be unsuited to the columns of an American journal.

The Report concludes by recommending, 1st, the nomination of agents to foreign countries to promote a colored emigration; 2d, the immediate designation of the towns of Cape Haytien, St. Marc, Port-au-Prince, Gonaives and Cayes as ports of disembarkment for emigrants, with the power of adding



Port-de-Paix, Miragoave, Jeremie, Aquen and Jacmel, in case of need ; 3d, the nomination of two inspectors in the north and south (of Hayti) for the purpose of surveying the public lands and making an exact description of them ; 4th, the ordering from the U. S. of a certain number of wooden houses which could be immediately put up for emigrants ; 6th, the placing at the disposal of each Haytian bureau of emigration a locality destined to receive the emigrants on their disembarkment, and authorizing them to provide for their wants for the first eight days ; 8th, the printing of three thousand copies of this Report.

The Report is signed by F. Ju. Joseph, Secretary of the Interior of Agriculture.—The Report is followed by an ordinance (arrete) of President Geffard, decreeing the recommendations with which the Report concludes.

In the concluding portion of the Secretary's Report, he says : 'There ought to be, doubtless, still further measures taken, (that is, still greater inducements given to emigrants,) but for this purpose it is necessary to have legislative authority.'

The Chambers opened to-day, and laws to favor emigration will be introduced. The price of the best Government land will be fixed at a lower rate than that of our wild western lands, and it is even stated that to large colonies of intelligent men, of well established character, certain fertile tracts of country will be gratuitously given.

JAS. REDPATH.

PORT-AU-PRINCE, Hayti, Aug. 23, 1860.

#### LETTERS FROM THE OLD WORLD--NO. LXXI.

SALEM PARSONAGE, HALIFAX, (Eng.) }  
September 12th, 1860.

*My dear friend* :—Your letter of August 23d, and your September journal, have just reached me ; and, in accordance with your request, I take the first opportunity of resuming my 'Old World' scriptures, which have (from divers unforeseen circumstances) been discontinued very much longer than I had intended them to be ; and *far too long* if my silence has led any of my friends to imagine that my interest in your journal itself, or in the great cause its publication is designed to subserve, has, in the slightest degree, diminished. For yourself, my friend, I am well aware that no assurances or explanations are needed on this point ; but it may be well to say to such of my friends as have been accustomed to peruse my scribblings, and have latterly sought for them in vain in your columns, that I expected you would, *while in this country*, send to Rochester such graphic accounts of people and things in Great Britain, that there would not be space left in your paper for my letters, nor readers found for them if they were published—so I withdrew from the field while you occupied the ground ; and as your British friends entertained the hope that your sojourn in our country would be a protracted one, there seemed nothing left for me to do in this respect. On your sad bereavement, the consequent interruption to all your plans, and your return home, under circumstances of great peril to yourself and of pain to your many friends on this side the ocean, it would have been wholly unwise to comment in print at the time ; and no sooner had the danger ceased than the prospect of your promised return to us became near, and then I purposed reporting for your American

friends some of your goings and doings, since you told them last winter so little of your British anti-slavery labors, from lack of time. Now that your decision is to remain at home through the winter, I will, without delay, comply with your wish, by resuming my letters at once, and promising (D. V.) to be more frequent in my communications in time to come than I have been of late.

Your Halifax friends are unanimous in their regrets at the postponement of your return to this country. I need scarcely say I share in this regret ; but with such a field of labor open before you in the States *for the coming winter*, it will not do to urge you to come to us at the time proposed. Nevertheless, on many accounts, the delay is unfortunate, and you must see to it that you appear on our shores early in the spring. Remember this, and arrange your plans accordingly.

Just now our Halifax Anti-Slavery Committee is scattered abroad in all directions.—Every one is on the wing, flitting about ; some are on the continent, others at Scarborough, Harrowgate, &c. No meetings have lately been held, and, therefore, no arrangements relative to Dr. Cheever have yet been made. Several of the leading ministers are away, (your friend, Rev. Mr. M. inclusive,) so, until October opens upon us, I see no probability of our doing much anti-slavery work.—I am convinced we shall all be united in an earnest desire to see and to hear that bold, dauntless, Christian champion of freedom, Dr. Cheever, and to hear from his own lips the complicity of the American churches with the foul system of slavery. I sincerely trust he will be the means of enlightening many of our British friends on this subject. His testimony I believe to be exceedingly valuable. I do not think that his defamers can, to any extent, injure him in the minds of people on this side the ocean. Rev. D. M. GRAHAM, a Free Will Baptist minister from New York, gave a lecture lately, in Halifax, on *Slavery*. I regretted that this 'flitting' season of the year caused his auditors to be so few—for the array of facts which he gave us, as regards the churches, was important and startling, yet *not more startling than true*. I hope Mr. Graham's anti-slavery labors will do much good. When our people sin by admitting a *pro-slavery* minister to their pulpits—'I wot that through ignorance they do it'—they need enlightening in order that they may discern a 'wolf in sheep's clothing' from a genuine sheep, (or rather shepherd.) The subject of slavery is certainly being brought considerably before our people at this time, and subscriptions towards some branch of the cause are being levied in all directions. In one town we have Mr. Mitchell begging for a chapel and school in Toronto. In another, Mr. Troy, collecting for a similar object in Canada West. Here, there is Rev. W. King, asking contributions for Buxton Settlement ; and there is Mr. Day, raising funds towards starting a newspaper. Then we have a host of colored friends going up and down the country, east, west, north and south, collecting money to buy their various relatives out of slavery. I cannot but wish that this latter tribe was thinned, for my mind greatly misgives me as to the genuine nature of all the cases, and yet it is difficult for good-natured JOHN BULL to say no : and *far distant* be the day when

a true son or daughter of England shall listen unmoved to the recital of another's wrongs, without lending a helping hand to their removal. I think with dear, good, Christian HANNAH MORE, that it is better to be deceived in ninety-nine cases, than to let the hundredth perish from want. I must say, just here, that I have read with extreme interest your first of August address, and could not fail to feel highly gratified by the just award of praise you have in it rendered to that noble band of Englishmen who were the instruments of giving liberty to eight hundred thousand of their West Indian brethren. I can verify, by my own experience, what you say in regard to 'the most ignorant slave on the banks of the Red River,' who 'has, by some means or other, come to learn that the English are the friends of the African race.' Of the many scores of fleeing fugitives that it was my privilege to see and to assist, during my sojourn in the United States, I never met one who did not smile all over his face when I said, 'Don't be afraid of me ; I'm an Englishwoman.'

Many on this side the ocean are looking with intense anxiety to the Presidential election and its results. I cannot but regret exceedingly that our friend Hon. W. H. SEWARD was not nominated as the anti-slavery candidate. Of ABRAHAM LINCOLN we seem to have heard nothing until recently, and can but trust that, if successful, he may prove to have more anti-slavery principle than some of us give him credit for. Your sketch of the several Presidential candidates almost makes me hopeless for the future of the American people, since (as you have so frequently said) we must judge of a people from the character of the men they delight to honor. Still, whoever be the commanders of the various armies in the field, it is clear that the coming battle will be one between SLAVERY and FREEDOM.—Thousands of eyes will be turned towards the scene of action. 'May God defend the right !'

It is much to be regretted that our youthful Prince of Wales is to visit Washington during the reign of Buchanan. A man so entirely the tool of the slave party, as is the present President will not fail to throw a soft haze around the beloved, 'patriarchal institution,' which will carefully conceal all its hideous features. Hon. W. H. Seward, or Hon. Charles Sumner, will, I trust, meet the Prince while he is in the States. It will, indeed, be lamentable if the natural *British* hatred of wrong and oppression be lessened in so young a breast by contact with the apologists of slavery.

To turn to home matters for a moment.—You will have a vivid recollection of our charming People's Park here ? therefore you will be interested to learn that on the 14th of August, (the anniversary of its opening,) a very fine statue of the generous donor (FRANK CROSSLEY, Esq., M. P. for the West Riding) was inaugurated. It is a beautiful work of art, and deemed an excellent likeness of the noble and public-spirited man it represents.—A pretty little temple, opening out of the summer-house in the center of the terrace, contains it. St. Swithin has, this summer, proved a *weeping saint*, so our fine days have been few ; but, happily, the 14th of August was a beautiful day. Crowds thronged to the Park, from town and country, to witness the



ceremony of the inauguration, or rather to look upon the *really few* who were near enough to see and hear what passed! Of the latter number was Dr. C., who heard, he says, 'every word of every speech.' It is believed there were between thirty and forty thousand people in the Park during this gala afternoon, and general holiday, and every one looked in good humor and full of enjoyment. All honor to the name of CROSSLEY! Halifax may well be proud of such a family, and delight to honor any of the noble band of brothers. I wish you could have been among us on that interesting occasion. Your Halifax friends frequently enquire for you, and desire, from time to time, their kindest regards, best wishes, and earnest hopes to see you again before long.

With the full intention of writing again ere long, I remain, as always,

Your faithful friend,

JULIA G. CROFTS.

#### POLITICAL ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

An adjourned meeting of the Political Anti-Slavery Convention, which met in Boston, May 29th, was commenced in Worcester Sept. 19th, at Washburn Hall. The object of the Convention was to 'consider the propriety of organizing a political party upon the basis of an anti-slavery interpretation of the United States Constitution, with the avowed purpose of abolishing slavery in the States, as well as in the Territories of the Union.'

The meeting was called to order at 10 o'clock by Mr. Stephen S. Foster, of Worcester. Mr. Wm. Coe, of Worcester, was chosen President *pro tem.*, and A. P. Brown, Sec'y.

Mr. Foster read the Call for the Convention. He was followed by Mr. Frederick Douglass, of Rochester, N. Y., who addressed the Convention on the necessity of a return to the radical anti-slavery ideas for which the originators of the anti-slavery movement in this country contended, and their advancement by political means.

Mr. Foster reviewed the position of the American A. S. Society at some length.

Mr. Douglass, and Mr. E. T. Hutchins, of Killingly, Conn., and Mr. Locke, of Athol, followed in remarks upon the principles to be adopted by the new Society; the last in defence of the American A. S. Society.

The meeting then adjourned for dinner.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

At the commencement of the afternoon session, Mr. Foster again spoke, in continuation of his remarks in the forenoon. He concluded by offering the following series of resolutions, as embodying the principles and platform on which it is proposed to organize the new party:—

Resolved, That we, the friends of freedom, assembled in Convention, in the city of Worcester, on the 20th day of September, 1860, do hereby organize ourselves into a political association, to be known as the Union Democratic Party of the United States of America, upon the following basis and platform of principles:

1. All men, irrespective of color, condition, sex, or nationality, have a natural and indefeasible right to themselves, and no government, association, or combination of men on earth, can, by any possibility, give to one man any right of property in the person or labor of another, except by his own voluntary consent.

2. It is the right and duty of all men to defend their own liberty by the most potent means which God and nature have placed in their power, at whatever cost to their oppressors. 'Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God,' in black as well as white—in bond as well free.

3. It is the imperative duty of our National Government to protect, impartially, all the inhabitants of the country in the full enjoyment of all their natural rights; and any administration which, under any pretext whatever, seeks to evade this duty, is false to the fundamental principles of democracy, false to the Constitution, false to every principle of moral obligation which binds us together as a civil community, a dishonor to the country, and utterly unworthy of the confidence and support of any genuine friend of freedom.

4. The people of the United States, and not the Supreme Court, are the ultimate arbiter in all questions involving the interpretation of the Constitution. By our theory of government, the people are the only rightful rulers of the country; the courts, as well as the legislature and the executive, being mere agents entrusted with authority to execute the popular will;—and hence it is their right and duty to review, and for sufficient reasons to reverse the decisions of their courts; and any court which should refuse to obey the clearly expressed will of a popular majority would be an intolerable despotism, which should be at once abolished.

5. The United States Constitution, fairly interpreted, is entirely and unequivocally on the side of freedom. It prohibits the existence of slavery in the States, and invests the Federal Government with ample powers for its overthrow, wherever found, whether under territorial or State legislation; and the friends of freedom ought everywhere to insist upon the immediate application of those powers to the removal of an evil which has already made our country a reproach to the cause of freedom throughout the civilized world.

6. As justice is impartial, and all men are by nature equal, all laws, to secure our respect and support, must be based upon general principles, operating equally upon all classes of society, securing to each an equal share in all the natural gifts of a common Creator.

6. Slavery is organized piracy, with many features of barbarism and infamy unknown to any system of piracy ever practiced upon the high seas; and any Administration, by whatever name it may be called, which sanctions or tolerates it, in any of the States or territories of the Union, is not only guilty of all the crimes inherent in the slave system, but is also guilty of treason to the Constitution which it has sworn to support. Consequently, we shall recognize no such Administration as the legitimate government of the Republic; we shall not act with it; nor shall we recognize any of its acts as having any legal or binding force other than that which traitors can give to the statutes which they enact, and as all the powers of the government are dependent upon the purse, we shall consent to no appropriations from the national treasury till it shall become in fact what its founders designed it should be, and what they made it in form, the impartial protector of all from whom it required allegiance or submission.

8 Any act, which, if done by a private individual, would be a crime against natural justice, when done by an officer of government is equally criminal, and doubly dangerous. It is, therefore, the duty of all good citizens to resist, in all suitable ways, the execution of the infamous fugitive enactment of 1850, and all other legislation intended to subvert the rights of individuals, whether black or white, for the benefit of a favored few.

Finally: Recognizing in woman the same capacity for government which we find in man, and the same necessity for its protecting care, we invoke her aid and co-operation in this sublime moral effort to transform, by peaceful political means, a slaveholding despotism into a model of republican liberty, justice and equality.

Mr. Foster spoke at some length, in explanation and defence of these resolutions, taking the ground that the United States Constitution is eminently an anti-slavery instrument, which, if carried out in its letter and spirit, as it should be, would set at liberty every slave in the land.

Dr. Calvin Cutter, of Warren, thought it not so clear that the Constitution was anti-slavery; if it was so, there were some features in it which might possibly be construed otherwise. He thought it might be well to amend the Constitution in some respect, to set the matter at rest beyond all peradventure.

The Chairman, Mr. Foster, and Mr. Douglass, thought the Constitution well enough as it was; it was in letter and spirit thoroughly anti-slavery, if strictly carried out. Mr. F. Douglass made an eloquent speech in defence of the principle of organizing a political party on the basis of an anti-slavery interpretation of the Constitution.

#### EVENING SESSION.

In the evening, (Dr. Mann in the chair,) Mr. Foster offered the following resolutions:

Resolved, That it is neither consistent nor possible for a people who depend upon government for the protection of their liberty and rights, to abolish the institution of slavery, and defend the liberty and rights of its victims, by moral power alone; and hence, any scheme of emancipation which either ignores political action altogether, or depends upon pro-slavery political parties to do its work, is radically defective in principle, and must inevitably end in failure and bitter disappointment.

Resolved, That the great want of our country, at the present time, is a National Political Education Society, whose object shall be to educate the people, the rulers of the country, in a thorough knowledge of the fundamental principles of democratic government, and of their duty to defend and enforce those principles in every part of the Union, for the impartial protection of its inhabitants, irrespective of color, condition, sex or nationality.

Resolved, That a Committee of five be appointed by this Convention to correspond with prominent friends of freedom in different sections of the country upon this subject, with power to call a Convention for the purpose of organizing such an association at such time and place as they may deem expedient.

Resolved, That in this sublime moral effort to arrest the downward tendency of our government, and transform a slaveholding despotism into a model of justice, simplicity and equality, by the only means which afford any rational hope of success, viz., the education of the people in the science of government, we invoke the aid of all classes of our fellow-citizens, but especially do we solicit the co-operation of those manufacturers of public sentiment, the clergy and the conductors of our periodical press, without whose ultimate sanction and aid no work of national reform can ever succeed.

Lucy Stone made a short speech in defence of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and contended that the U. S. Constitution is not anti-slavery, and thought it should be so amended before action under it, that it could not be construed in favor of slavery.

Mr. Foster defended his position.

Adjourned.

#### SECOND DAY—MORNING SESSION.

Met at 10 o'clock. The Committee on Nominations reported the name of Dr. Daniel Mann, of Ohio, for President, and William W. Wilson for Secretary.

Lucy Stone, A. P. Brown, and Dr. Calvin Cutter were added to the Business Committee.

Dr. Mann spoke in favor of the new party movement.

Mr. Higginson was opposed to the whole movement, believing it to be uncalled for and impractical.

Messrs. Douglass and Foster spoke in answer to Mr. Higginson.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

In the afternoon, after the reading of the various resolutions before the Convention, Mr. D. D. Draper, of Hopedale, made a speech, opposed to Mr. Foster's position, and in defence of the American Anti-Slavery Society. He criticised Mr. Foster's position as a non-resistant, believing Mr. Foster's theory to be inconsistent with his practice.

Mr. J. A. Howland spoke in defence of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and against the anti-slavery construction of the United States Constitution.



Messrs. Douglass and Foster spoke in answer to Mr. Howland—Mr. Foster defending his position as a non-resistant.

#### EVENING SESSION.

In the evening, on motion of Mr. Foster, the resolutions in favor of an Anti-Slavery Educational Society were adopted. Mr. Foster moved the adoption of the platform, and the formation of an Executive Committee to make nominations, and call another Convention, if they shall see fit.

Messrs. Foster and Douglass made addresses in favor of the motion. After Mr. Howland had criticised their remarks, Mr. Foster's motion was adopted.

The Chairman of the Nominating Committee reported:—

For the Anti-Slavery Educational Society's Committee—S. S. Foster, J. H. Stephenson, of Boston, A. P. Brown, Frederick Douglass, J. H. Fowler.

For Executive Committee—S. S. Foster, of Worcester; J. H. Stephenson, of Boston; A. P. Brown, of Worcester; Frederick Douglass, of Rochester, N. Y.; J. H. Fowler, of Cambridge; Ernestine L. Rose, of New York; Elizabeth C. Stanton, John Pierpont.

The Report was accepted, and the nominees elected.

On motion of Mr. Douglass, the following resolution was adopted:—

Resolved, That the members of this Convention, called to consider the proposition to form a sound Abolition Political Party, extend their earnest sympathy and their hearty God-speed to the little band of faithful Abolitionists which has nominated Gerrit Smith as their candidate to be supported for the Presidency in the coming election.

After remarks by Mr. Douglass and Mr. Foster, the Convention adjourned, subject to the call of the Executive Committee.

DANIEL MANN, President.

WM. A. WILSON, Secretary.

[From the Principia.]

#### DISCUSSION BETWEEN GERRIT SMITH AND WILLIAM GOODSELL.

GERRIT SMITH TO WILLIAM GOODSELL.

WM. GOODSELL:—The review of me in your last number is long. Mine of it will be short.

The Liberty Party Convention, held a fortnight ago in Syracuse, put you and me in nomination. I shall vote for you, with all my heart. You give your reasons, some explicitly, and some hint-wise, why I am not fit to be voted for. These reasons are,

1st. *That I despair of the people's voting slavery to death.*

It is true that for many years, my expectations that this great evil would be thus peacefully ended, has been very slight. But has my desire that it should be, lost any of its strength? Or have I ever, even for one moment, turned away from this, the only proper mode of ending it, to any other? Have I not, during all these years, written three-fourths, or seven-eighths, of all the Addresses and Resolutions adopted by our Abolition Political Conventions, and contributed three-fourths or seven-eighths of all the moneys used to promote Abolition Political action? Did not the sum which I sent to the late Syracuse convention, bear this large proportion?—and was it not accompanied by my promise to co-operate with the Convention on any scale it might adopt? I should think that, instead of casting me off, because of my little hope that the people will, with their miserable religion, ever be brought to vote against slavery, you would honor me for still doing so much, whilst having so little hope. We are wont to honor the men who keep their hands perseveringly to their good work. But they who thus persevere, notwithstanding their little hope of success, deserve especial commendation. And what if I should allow that my little hope in this direction is

wrong, as perhaps it is, nevertheless is not your inference from it that I have turned my back upon the great religious principles that underlie the anti-slavery cause, very illogical, as well as very uncharitable?

I must think that this Reason No. One, has not had a large share in bringing you to the conclusion not to vote for me. For during all these years of my growing dependency, you have continued to vote for me, and to use your lips and pen to multiply votes for me.

2d. *I am in favor of annexing Cuba and Mexico to this nation!*

I own that I am, provided that the people on each side desire it. I do not say, provided the demagogues who play pranks in the name of the people, desire it. As you are a ware, I mean by the people, the bond and free, the male and female.

But neither to Reason No. Two is it owing that you decline voting for me. For during all those years that I have held to this conditional right of annexation, you have cast your vote for me, and called on others to do likewise.

3d. *I am for making compensation to the emancipating slaveholders.*

I admit that, as far back as my first thoughts on the subject I have believed that should the slaveholders emancipate, they would have a fair claim on the North—on their Northern partner, equally guilty with themselves—to make up a part of their present loss. I admit too, that the mass of the abolitionists, have held me to be wrong in this belief, and that, here and there, a prominent abolitionist has, on account of it, called down the public contempt upon me. Nevertheless, I cannot think that Reason No. Three, has exerted much influence in bringing you to your conclusion not to vote for me. For you have always known my views on this subject, expressed freely as they have been, both in and out of Congress, and yet your vote, with every other you could get, has always been given to me.

4th. *I am for the disunion of the States. I am a 'disunion candidate.'*

It is true that if North or South, East or West, will leave the Union, (which I do not apprehend,) I shall not be in favor of preventing it by bloodshed. I shall deprecate the secession, and do what I can, morally and politically, to prevent it. But I shall not be in favor of raising armies against the seceders. Would you be? Would you be found with Senator Douglas at this point? I hope not. But if you would not, then wherein do we differ at this point of the disunion of the States? Nevertheless, however all this may be, it is not Reason No. Four that costs me the loss of your vote. For in spite of what I have said, both in and out of Congress, against shedding blood to preserve the Union, your vote, and your influence on other's votes, have been for me.

5th. *I propose to use our Abolition Conventions and facilities toward establishing a religion contrary to the religion of the Bible.*

I can only say that the religion of the Bible is that which (with very poor success I admit,) I try to make my own religion.

But what is your authority for charging me with this purpose? You find it in the following paragraph of my letter to the Syracuse Convention—the letter which you have now been criticising.

'We do not need to employ presses and lecturers to convince the people that slavery and the dramshop are among the greatest crimes and abominations. The people are already saturated with this convention. But we do need to employ them to teach the people the true religion—the simple religion of reason, common sense, and Jesus Christ. Had they this religion, they would be drawn to rational and righteous voting as naturally and necessarily as the needle is drawn to the pole.' What I mean by 'rational and righteous voting,' is explained in the following paragraph from the same letter:

'I trust that your Convention will make a National ticket, and also a New York State

ticket. Not that I suppose either will get many votes. But that I warmly desire that the handful who wish to vote in accordance with the claims of absolute rectitude, of justice and mercy, may have the needed facilities for doing so. A man is made better and stronger, by voting in the way his pure conscience bids him vote; and happy is the influence of his example on those who see him so vote.'

Here we have all there is in Reason No. Five. Surely, surely then, you must be deceived if you believe that this Reason had much weight in turning you away from my nomination.

No; it is not any, nor all of these five Reasons that have brought you to decide not to vote for one you have so often voted for, and to warn others not to vote for him. The one Reason, as his Review so plainly shows, which has wrought this great change in my old and dear friend, is that he has, at last, lost all patience with what he regards as my religion. For years, he has had but little patience with it. He has now none at all. Let me say, by the way, that truly as you think of my religion, I still think well of yours. Yours is the true religion—for it has made you a just man. Would that all men had it. Would that in respect to your religion, I were myself far more like you! It is true that certain doctrines, or speculations, which you regard as essential parts of your religion, are in my eye, no part of it. And just here, is all the difference between us, that has led you to withhold your vote from me, and to persuade others to do likewise.

And so the Liberty party must divide again! And Orthodoxy must be the dividing line! This was one of the seams at which our old Abolition Party fell asunder. But it had never occurred to me until recently, that our little Liberty Party was in this danger! I say until recently for I was informed that some of the Orthodox members of the late Syracuse Convention, were strenuously opposed to my nomination.

Very sad, and deeply mortified am I at this new division of the handful of voting abolitionists, and at these new demands of orthodoxy. Smaller than ever, is now my hope that American slavery will be voted to death. Nevertheless I shall continue to vote to that end, and to talk and write and give money to that end. Moreover, if my hope of the peaceful termination of slavery should quite expire, I shall not, even then, think it right in you to hold me up as having abandoned political action for the slave, and as having run after expedients to supply the place of such action. Such action is the highest duty of the American people. God commands it; and He will accept nothing in the place of it.

Allow me, in closing my too hasty communication, to correct a few of your errors.

1st. When speaking in my letter of 'Church and Government,' I used both words in a general and comprehensive sense. Had I referred to local Churches, I would at least have remembered that 'the Church at Peterboro' is an abolition church.

2d. You think I wrote a part of the Resolutions adopted by the Syracuse Convention. I wrote none of them, and knew nothing of any of them until after the Convention.

3d. I did not mean that Dr. Cheever had changed his personal religion—for I did not know that he had. I meant by 'his religion,' (and I ought to have expressed myself more clearly,) the current religion. This he has 'outgrown,'—and an emphatically good and great man is he. By the way, you pass but a sorry compliment on his Church, and on its creed, and on the Bible, when you represent his church as still 'needing to study its Bible and its church creed,' in order to learn its duty of not voting for slave-catchers and dramshop candidates. You think that men need to go to the Bible to learn this duty. On the contrary, I love God because He has given us so high a being, that we need not look into any book to learn this duty. You think that Dr. Cheever's Church has the true religion. I think they have not. No men have it who vote for slave-catching and dramshop candi-



dates. What a fact! Wm. Goodell casting off his old fellow laborer Gerrit Smith, and praising and numbering on the side of Freedom, Doctor Cheever's pro-slavery voting Church! Oh, Orthodoxy, how bewildering and misleading is thy power, even over the wisest and the best of men! Your friend,

September 15, 1860. GERRIT SMITH.

WILLIAM GOODSELL TO GERRIT SMITH.

MY DEAR SIR:—You commence yours, by promising to be short. I can only promise to be as short as my work will permit. You have pointed out some mistakes of mine. I shall have to point out some of yours.

One of the first things that strikes me, on perusal of your's, is your *seeming* effort to make out that all my reasons, for the conclusions to which I arrive, are but ostensible and not real ones. If this be your meaning, you have made a mistake, as I shall show you.

You take up several of those reasons in course. 'Reason No. one,' you think, had little influence with me. 'Reason No. two,' could not have been the true reason. 'Reason No. Three,' you put with 'No. 1,' as having had little influence with me. It 'is not reason No. four,' you say, 'that cost me, (you) the loss of your (my) vote.' And surely I must be deceived, you say, if I think that 'Reason No. five' had much weight with me. And finally, you say, 'It is *not any, nor all* of these reasons that have determined me. So you shut me up, in your own imagination, to 'the *one* reason,' which, as you very incorrectly state it, is, that I have 'lost all patience with you, as regards your religion.'

You are mistaken. Every one of the reasons that I either stated explicitly, or hinted at, had weight, had great and burdensome weight with me. I never gave either of them, (nor could I truthfully) as *the* reason. But each of them was a reason. The aggregate weight of them—some of them long borne—at length determined me. You will recollect that, as the old proverb hath it—'It was the last pound of feathers that broke the camel's back.' Several previous burdens had been heavy, but it was *that* that necessitated the break-down. In the present case, there is no occasion, if I were able to tell, as I am not, which of the several burdens was the heaviest. I only know they grew heavier, and heavier, to the last. A weight, long carried, grows heavier, the longer it is carried, even if no addition at all be made to it. I know I deliberated with myself and friends, whether I could hold out longer, before the last weight was added. I know too, that several, (including some to whom your sixth, or final '*one* reason,' could, I think, have occasioned no burden at all, but the reverse,) gave up, and ceased to help carry the load, before I did. Did you never, in your multiplied relations with men, find yourself in a similar position, and finally conclude to relieve yourself of what you had long and painfully borne?

But lest you should misunderstand me, just here, let me digress a moment, to correct *another* of your mistakes, before I can complete the correction of this. You speak of me as 'casting you off' and again, as 'casting off' my 'old fellow laborer, Gerrit Smith.' And you think 'a great change is wrought in your dear old friend,' and that he has 'lost all patience' with you. Be assured, my 'dear old friend,' that this is all a mistake. I have not the slightest notion of 'casting you off' any more than you and I had at a nominating convention, at Syracuse, once, when we were both agreed in opposing (pretty strenuously on your part) the nomination for the Governorship of this State, of our 'dear old friend, and fellow laborer,' Alvan Stewart, than whom, a truer man I never knew, a man who, as endowed with some of nature's rarest gifts, and as replenished with some of the choicest treasures of acquired knowledge, neither of us could have expected to find, in the State, his equal. We judged, (at least I did,) that the very richness of his acquisitions, in certain directions, the brilliancy of his wit, the peculiarities of his genius, the mighty impulses that moved him at times, transforming him into a

thinking, speaking, walking Vesuvius, among his fellows, transfixing one, with the shafts of his wits here, and petrifying another with his thunderbolts there, the very fact of his splendid genius, with the eccentricities and peculiarities that were given to him along with it, disqualified, rather than qualified him for *that particular post*, requiring, as it did, an equal balance, a steadiness of administration, a soundness of judgment, that could better be found among less highly gifted, less splendid, less powerful men. We hardly dared to trust our Samson among our pillars of State, lest he should pull them down over our heads, and over his own. What a contrast was he to William Jay, who was your choice for that position, and to James G. Birney, whom we had nominated for President!

It was as our candidate for Governor, that you and I opposed Alvan Stewart. It is as my candidate for President of the United States, that I have declined supporting Gerrit Smith. I have not cast him off, as a model man of wealth, as a world wide philanthropist, as an eloquent orator and writer, as one of nature's noblemen, an honest and earnest reformer, a radical abolitionist, a temperance teetotaler, a liquor prohibitionist, a benefactor and friend of the poor, a hater of monopolies, an advocate of equal rights, and what shall I say more? Assuredly I had not cast him off as a beloved and honored friend. Nor must I be understood to imply that the peculiar disqualifications of Alvan Stewart are those of Gerrit Smith. I only mean that, in both cases, the highest gifts of genius failed to secure the precise qualifications needed for *certain particular posts*—qualifications abundantly possessed by men, inferior in other respects.

What I have said of the heavy burdens I have borne, in supporting Gerrit Smith, have sole reference to supporting him as a candidate for office—nothing more.

With politicians, like the late Henry Clay, it is common to speak of desertion of *friends*, whenever *votes* are withheld. I trust it will not be so among abolitionists. You and I, Gerrit Smith, do not value friendship as means of securing votes. Perhaps it might have been so, with us, had we been subjected to like temptations with Henry Clay. As it is, we shall not limit our friendships to those who vote for us, nor consider it a *cutting off* of friendships when votes are withheld. You say you intend to vote for me. I thank you. But do not, I beseech you, do so, if you can find, as I should think you easily might, a person better qualified for the post than I am. Your not voting for me will occasion no interruption of our mutual friendship. I shall not think that you are 'casting me off,' or 'losing patience,' with me, or my 'orthodoxy,' if you do so. Among the thousands of abolitionists that you and I are more or less acquainted with, there are very few that we ever voted or expect to vote for. Only for one of them at a time, can we vote for, for Governor or President. It would be sad to think that we were 'casting off' all the rest of them.

The way is now prepared for me to inquire, in the next place, on what grounds you seem to discredit the verity of the reasons I assigned for not accepting you as my candidate for the Presidency. You give but one reason, which is this—that hitherto, I have voted for you, and asked others do so.

Well: so far as the alleged facts are concerned, I confess you have me on the hip, and there is no escape for me. I have thus voted, and have asked others to vote. To this charge, if it be one, or if it be a *verification* of a charge, I must plead guilty, and throw myself on the mercy of the court. But before sentence of condemnation for want of frankness or truthfulness in adducing my 'Reasons No. one, two, three, four, and five,' is pronounced against me, I must beg leave to scrutinize the logic by which the inference of my lack of frankness, &c., is drawn from the premises—the facts of the case. And even if the inferences be found legitimate, I shall claim a consideration of the palliating circumstances, that may serve to mitigate the se-

verity of the sentence to be pronounced against me.

First, then, as to the inferences. Because I *once* voted for you, must I perpetually *continue* to do so, or forfeit my claim to sincerity, in giving my reasons for not continuing thus to vote?

If it *were* so, that certain objections which I *now* see, against voting for you, did not formerly appear to me to be objections at all, does *that* prove that they do not *now* appear to me strong, and even insuperable objections?

Suppose it were so, that your words of discouragement and despondency, did not, much, if at all, trouble me at first, can you not conceive it possible, that, after the lapse of years, I may have seen so much of the petrifying effects upon our ranks, that the constant repetition of them, and of the jeering and triumphant echoes of them, in the pro-slavery journals, (as it is, at this moment,) may have become distressing and annoying to me, and to many others? And might it not be possible that, at last, I may have honestly come to the conclusion that I must have a more hopeful candidate, or none at all. Is the truthful declaration of this reason of non-concurrence with the nominating convention to be impugned, because experience has enabled me, as I may think, to be wiser to-day, than I was yesterday?

The truth is, that, in addition to what I have indicated above, I have, all along, cherished fond hopes that my much admired and honored friend, would one day, in the enjoyment of better health, and of more comprehensive conceptions of Divine Providence, and of the precious promises and predictions of God's word, get the better of his despondency.—But since I find that it is, as he confesses, a '*growing* despondency,' I conclude that it is unwise for me to continue voting for him longer. I do not see how this discredits the reality of my objections nor why it should excite suspicion that something else is my only true reason.

Suppose it were true that, at the first, I was well pleased with your proposal to annex Cuba and Mexico—to offer 'compensation' to slaveholders, for the emancipation of their slaves—to permit, in certain contingencies, the withdrawal of the slave States from the Union, without emancipating their slaves—is it incredible that I may have changed my mind? If I have, may I not say so? May I not give it as a reason why I decline voting for you? Or is the *verity* of my alleged reason to be discredited, because I formerly voted for you, without making any such objections?

You will see, my dear sir, how utterly illogical would be such inferences from the premises, furnished by the fact that I have heretofore voted for you, and from the supposed fact that I was formerly agreed with you, in those particulars.

Suppose then, again, (as is the fact) that I have voted for you heretofore, notwithstanding these disagreements between our views, is it incredible that these differences may appear far more important and vital in my view, now, than they formerly did? With my attention much engrossed in the study of the various phases of the anti-slavery enterprise, with new and clearer developments continually opening upon me, in the movements, discussions and events constantly passing in review before me, and with no personal business to divert or to divide my attention,—in the new circumstances or exigencies into which the cause is constantly coming, may I not see, or think I see, far greater necessity for concentrating all our energies on the *one great issue* of NATIONAL ABOLITION, standing sternly aloof from, and discountenancing all *side issues*, all contingent and hypothetical proposals or measures, whether about annexing foreign provinces, offering compensation, dividing the Union, or what not, and therefore, of insisting upon adhering to a platform, and selecting a candidate in harmony with these views? When you and I, Gerrit Smith, voted for Birney in 1840 and 1844, it was on a platform of measures that we would neither of us vote for



now, whoever might be the candidate, nor unless that candidate took higher ground than Birney then did. We have 'outgrown' our former position, and cannot go back into it, to please any one.

The *inferences*, therefore, that you draw from the fact that I formerly voted for you, are not legitimate. They are not logical.—They do not warrant you in setting aside my 'Reasons number one, two, three, four, and five,' as not being, to the extent I had alleged, the true, bona fide reasons for my declining to vote for you, now.

But what if it were otherwise? Suppose I am inconsistent in not now voting for you, because I formerly voted for you. Am I bound to bring my present self into harmony with my former self, though I do so, at the expense of my present convictions? It would be strange if this should be required of me, by Gerrit Smith, who has said—'Change, not Consistency, is my motto.'

Suppose, which I fear is, to some extent, the fact, that I was not rigidly self-consistent, in voting for you, while I disagreed with you, in several points of such great importance. I hold, (and hope you do,) that men ought to cultivate self-consistency, for the time being, consistency with their own present selves, their present principles, though not the spurious consistency that continues in the wrong, through the pride of consistency with their former selves.

If your argument against the validity of my alleged 'Reasons number one, two, &c.,' had any weight, that weight was derived from my supposed consistency in having voted for you, when I did. For if I was inconsistent, I ought, certainly, to get out of the inconsistency in some way, either by changing my views, and adopting your measures, or else by ceasing to vote for you. If unable to do the former, (as I certainly am,) I am shut up, of course, to the latter. No man sees all his inconsistencies. Few, if any of us, detect any of them, till time and experience compel the discovery. Let me tell you how, in this instance, I was compelled to detect mine.

During the Fremont furor in 1856, the Editor of the *Free Presbyterian*, excused voting for Fremont, by denying that a vote for Fremont was a vote for the sentiments of his Letter of acceptance, or for the platform of the Republican party. In my 'Radical Abolitionist,' I undertook to answer him. I asked him whether he did not think that a vote for Buchanan, was a vote for the published sentiments and measures of Buchanan, and of the Democratic Cincinnati Platform? The Editor replied by asking me whether in voting for Gerrit Smith, I intended to vote for the annexation of Cuba and Mexico. The question was a poser. How could I answer it? I forget how I did, or whether I attempted it, at all. But I found my strength shorn by my position. The Editor of the *Free Presbyterian* was not the only man that made the discovery of my weak spot, and pressed me on that point. In the whole course of my editorial navigation, so to speak, for one third of a century, I have no remembrance of ever having been so closely pushed, upon a lee shore, either before or since.—I resolved so take care how I got caught in that latitude and longitude again. When the Convention that nominated you for Governor, was held at Syracuse, in 1858, the question came up, in my mind, whether I would go in for it. I persuaded myself—so desirous was I, of still voting for you—that you would do much better, for Governor of the State of New York, than for President of the United States. In the Chair of State, at Albany, you could do nothing toward the annexation of Cuba or Mexico. I still think there was something in the distinction I then made. At Albany, you could not offer compensation to the slaveholders. At Albany, you would have seen human blood flow like water, (so you said, in your speeches,) before you would have given up the first 'black baby,' to the slave-catcher. At Washington, as we now learn, you would, to avoid blood-shed, allow two or three hundred thousand kidnappers to run away with four

millions of your equal fellow citizens, entitled, under the Constitution, and by your oath of Office, to your protection from kidnappers—husbands, wives, fathers, mothers, children, babes and all, at wholesale. This, of course, I did not foresee, while advocating your nomination at Syracuse, in 1858, nor while using my pen, afterward, to get votes for you. Did I thereby obligate myself to vote for you, for President, in 1860, to go to Washington City, with your proclamation of amnesty preceding you—advertising the slaveholders, in effect—though not in intention—beforehand, that when you come to be President, they would need only to threaten civil war, and make Congress, and the nation, and the President believe them in earnest, in order to secure the Presidential consent to their unmolested abduction from the nation, and from under its protection, of one seventh part of its citizens?

If I did thus obligate myself, by my vote for you to be Governor of New York, in 1858, and if I may not now object to your views of a contingent tolerance of Southern Secession, as a valid reason against voting for you for President, without subjecting myself to the suspicion of having adduced a fictitious reason, and without being now told by you, in the face of my published declaration to the contrary, that my 'Reason number four,' as you designate it, is not a Reason that costs you the loss of my vote, then, in that case, I shall begin to think that voting for you is a more hazardous thing than I had ever supposed it to be; and that I ought to be doubly careful how I now follow you into the track that, to me, seems marked out, by your Letter to the Syracuse Convention. I should be sorry to be told, four years hence, that any objection I might then make, to such an employment of 'presses and lecturers,' as I might then find in operation by the party to teach the people 'the simple religion of reason,' as set forth in your 'Three Discourses' on that subject, must be fictitious and unreal, because I had found no fault with your proposal to the Syracuse Convention of 1860, and had supported you, as a Presidential Candidate on the programme of that Letter.

You will see, still further, the force of this, when I assure you, truthfully, that I was not aware of your views of compensation, until you assisted in organizing a compensation Emancipation Society, in company with Elihu Burritt and others, the greater part of them never known among us, as abolitionists—nor was I aware of your willingness to allow a Southern secession from the Union, until I learned it from the manuscript you sent me, of the Letter you afterward addressed to Frederick Douglass, but originally addressed to me, for publication in the *Principia*. Of this latter fact I apprized you sufficiently, I think, when I wrote you my objections to the sentiments of the manuscript, asking you to reconsider the subject, before publishing, and saying that, though I should regret its publication by you, I would not decline publishing it in the *Principia*, but notifying you that if I did, it would necessarily occasion an earnest debate between us, respecting it, which, I thought, it would be better for both of us with our other labors, and present condition of health, to avoid.

You must certainly have seen, in this, that I was seeking no bone of contention with you and was not conjuring up any fictitious grounds for withholding my vote from you, while the true cause was only my 'impatience with what I regarded as your religion.'—Yet you now include this very subject in your category of my fictitious reasons, which you insist, had no weight with me, though I had told the public otherwise. I must claim to know, for myself, what my reasons are, and if I am to be regarded a truthful man, I must claim credence for my public statements of them, at least until some plausible grounds for discrediting them, shall be furnished. Your letter, as a whole, bears ample testimony to your belief in my integrity. To Gerrit Smith, then, I appeal to bear me witness, that Gerrit Smith's entire course of argument against the

reality of my 'Reasons. No. one, two, three, four, and five' is fallacious and sophistical from beginning to end, without power to convince even himself of their soundness, when he shall have deliberately re-examined it.

What occasion can you have had for your unreasonable suspicion that mere theological 'impatience' with you, on my part, was the basis of all my ostensible objections against you, as a candidate, and that those ostensible objections were not real ones? Did no one but myself, or those who hold my Theological views, in opposition to your's, object as strongly as I have done, to some of your measures and views embraced in 'Reasons No. one, two, three and four' as you call them?

Take your favorite measure of 'COMPENSATION' for example. You admit that 'the mass of abolitionists have held you to be wrong' in your proposal of compensation. Is it strange that I should happen to be one of them? Do you include 'the mass of abolitionists' in the same implied imputation that your reasonings cast upon me? Or is it only in the case of 'orthodox' abolitionists that suspicion should be indulged? 'Here and there,' you say, 'a prominent abolitionist has, on account of it (the proposal of compensation) called down the public contempt upon me.'—Was William Goodell one of them? What 'orthodox' abolitionist was of the number? Yet William Goodell and other 'orthodox' abolitionists, were, at least, as strongly opposed, on principle, to the policy of paying a compensation for the relinquishment of crime, as were any of the so called 'liberal' creeds.

If Abram Pryne too sharply reproved you at your compensation convention at Cleveland—if Mr. Garrison in his *Liberator* accused you, on that occasion, of having 'thrown another somerset'—if the *Anti-Slavery Standard* and the *Anti-Slavery Bugle* chimed in, laughing at the Radical Political Abolitionists about their candidate, if Parker Pillsbury or Theodore Parker pounced upon you, with their ponderous armor, without mercy, if Henry C. Wright, if Stephen S. Foster and Abby Kelly Foster, looked sorrowfully upon you, as upon a fallen brother (I cannot tell, precisely, whether each and all of these are to be included among the 'prominent abolitionists' to whom your statement might be truthfully applied,) I should like to know whether you think that in their case, their strong condemnation of your proposals was merely ostensible and not real, and only resorted to, as a cover for their theological prejudices against you, and because they had 'lost all patience with what they regarded your religion'?

In the case of either or all of these, had their denunciations been as sharp as Pryne's, or their sarcasms as severe as Garrison's, you never would have thought them owing to 'impatience with what they regarded your religion'—for their theology was above the suspicion of any taint of 'orthodox' exclusiveness and bigotry. But when William Goodell concludes to decline voting for a Presidential candidate on that platform, his contrary views on the subject having been on distinct public record, ever since 1833, if not earlier, how shall so strange a phenomenon be accounted for? In no way assuredly, says Gerrit Smith, but by the supposition that he has 'lost all patience with what he regards my religion'!—Is it not possible, my dear friend, that some of the theological prejudice and impatience may have been on the other side? Have you always expressed yourself in terms of patience, with the theology which you opposed, in your Three Discourses on the 'RELIGION OF REASON'? Examine its pages, with candor, and see. You think me 'uncharitable.' You claim to have a very charitable religion. Can you not charitably believe me to be conscientious in declining to vote on the compensation platform, even for the pleasure of voting for my old friend Gerrit Smith, whom I have so often voted for? Can you not charitably believe me to be truthful, when I assign this, as among my real reasons?

It may seem strange to you—I presume it does—that I was not, all along, aware of your



views of compensation and of dissolution.—Perhaps my ignorance or forgetfulness was a fault. But such was the fact, and in this, too, I am not alone. To most of your friends, the announcement of those views, as being *your's*, was as new as to me. Within my own circle of acquaintances and distant correspondents, I know it to have been the general fact. We were taken by surprise. Mr. Garrison believed what he said, in the use, to be sure, of a sarcastic phrase, that you had made a great change in your views. He was doubtless honest in representing it as a great and sudden change. And you ought not to think him guilty of intentional injustice in the matter.

Perhaps it may have been no fault of your's—certainly it could have been no intentional fault—that your views on compensation and on a dissolution of the Union were not more generally and distinctly understood. Yet I think it probable that your general statements failed to convey to others all the details that were present to your own mind. You claim, I think, to have taught the right of dissolution and secession, in your advocacy of the right of annexing Cuba. And, as a general proposition, I admit you did, though I had forgotten the fact, but, on referring, now, to your speech, I cannot see that it goes beyond a general recognition of an abstract right, subject, of course, to the condition of its being righteously and beneficially exercised.\* I might, myself, thus assent to it, without admitting the moral or political right so to exercise the general right as to abdicate jurisdiction over the slaveholders and the slaves, while the latter remained slaves. My views of this were expressed in one of the Resolutions I sent to the Syracuse Convention.† I do not say that I have always had in mind that distinction, though I have, for several years. I remember too, when under the influence of that philosophy of despondency that I now repudiate, (and the more earnestly because I have felt as well as seen the effects of it) I once listened to proposals such as you now make. But that dark, dreary hour, with me, has gone by. I walk, to-day, and must vote, to-day, in the light of to-day, not in the darkness of that valley of the shadow of death through which I have passed, and in which so many of my dear old friends and fellow laborers are still groping.

You surely remember the earnestness with which, in my *Jubilee*, in personal conversation with you and by letter, I opposed your Mexico and Cuba speech, objecting to it in high moral grounds, inasmuch that you misunderstood me as impeaching your fidelity to the cause of Freedom. That controversy cost me the support of some of your over-zealous friends. I think, therefore, the reality of my present objections to it ought not to be impeached by you, even if I did err on the side of friendship, by continuing to give you my vote, in the belief entertained by many others of your friends, that your speech was an inadvertency, an error that you would 'outgrow' or lay aside, or forget,—or at any rate, forbear to press.

Weighty as were my objections to the positions of that speech, they would have been far weightier, had I read them in the light of your present expositions of them, as covering the ground of allowing a Southern secession without abolition. If the half-developed doctrine staggered me, in 1854 the clearer revelation of it, in 1860, compels me to stand from under its weight.—I objected to your

\* You said nothing, then, of a dissolution that should leave the slaves in their chains, a dissolution, by the State Governments without the consent of the slaves, a process which your exposition of your proposed annexation of Cuba would forbid, but against which I do not see that your present proposal provides. In your late letter to me, now before me, on which I am now commenting, I find nothing that looks as if you contemplated asking leave of the Slaves, before permitting their masters to secede. If they were to be the umpires between the North and the South, or to cast the balance vote, the alternative of submitting to dissolution to prevent bloodshed becomes hard to be understood.

† See last week's *Principia*.

plan for annexing Cuba, so long as slavery existed in this nation, that it was virtually, (not designedly) equivalent to a proposal to open a slave trade with Cuba, and transfer the slaves to this country. The taking of them under our jurisdiction as slaves, I contended, was essentially the same *national* act, in the one case, as in the other. And no consent of the slaves to the transfer, would authorize the process, in either form, any more than the entreaty of the slave Ambrose, authorized Dr. Ely to buy him, and hold him as a slave.

The application of the principle to the permission of a secession of the slaveholders, carrying their slaves along with them, is even worse. In effect (not intention) it is equivalent to authorizing a slave trade from the country letting the slave go out from under our national jurisdiction, as slaves, beyond our future control over them and their masters. The Cuban slaves, brought under our jurisdiction, might possibly be, one day, liberated, in their posterity, by a generation of abolitionists, (though it would doubtless diminish the facilities and defer if not prevent, the day of a peaceful abolition,) or by some other process, as, I think, you hoped.—But United States Slaves, allowed to go out of the present United States, (the Northern half being all then left of it,) would go where Northern abolition could never again get hold of them, to free them.

I have now, amply, and as I trust satisfactorily to yourself, vindicated the veritable reality, sincerity, integrity, and importance of my 'Reasons, No. one, two, three and four,' as you designate them, being all that you have discussed, except what pertains to Theology and Religion. I think you will now admit that each of those Reasons had great weight in my mind, aside from any Theological or Religious differences of opinion between us, however widely you may differ from me on those four topics. And you will concede to me my right, because it is my duty, to act in accordance with my own convictions, instead of acting in accordance with yours.

Next comes your disposal of what you designate my 'reason No. five,' being the only remaining one of the series—the *only one* in which I made any mention of any of your distinctive views of *Theology and Religion* in my Review of your letter to the Convention.

And yet, here again strange to tell, you persist in affirming as before, that what I said was a reason in my mind, for not voting for you, was not a reason in my mind, for thus deciding! You go so far, under this head, as to express your strong assurance that I must be 'self-deceived in thinking' that this was a reason with me! When I had read thus far, I concluded that you would next affirm—as a fair inference from all you had been saying—that, in fact, I had no reason, in my own mind, for not voting for you, and therefore you were assured that I certainly would vote for you. I could not think of any other logical conclusion to which you could arrive.—

After having, to your own satisfaction, analyzed each one of the five items of my bill of objections against voting for you, as they lay in my own mind, and after having reduced each one of them to a cypher in my own mind, your footing up of the sum, I supposed, would produce a row of cyphers at the bottom. Judge then, of my surprise, when I found that your footing up of the column, produced precisely the same aggregate that I had set down there, before the several items had been reduced by you, to cyphers. You reached the same conclusion that I had reached in my own mind, namely, that I was not going to vote for you. Here was a novel process in logic, that puzzled me. I was not long in discovering how you had effected it. In the place of my five cyphers as you had read them, you had put down 'THE ONE REASON'—NOT TO BE FOUND IN MY REVIEW OF YOUR SYRACUSE LETTER—but one which you had kindly manufactured for me, and put up there, just in the nick of time, to make up my original sum for me, and save me the necessity of voting for you. It was very considerate

in you, certainly, especially as—your ingenuity in my behalf, lost you a vote. For how could I have declined voting for you, without a single reason against doing so, in my own mind?

How did you reduce that 'Reason No. Five,' to a cypher? How did you prove that I had no reason in my own mind against voting for you, on this account, as I had alleged in my Review? You make certain extracts from your Syracuse letter, much the same as I had also made from it, in my Review, and having made them, you exclaimed, 'Here we have all there is in Reason No. Five. Surely, surely then, you must be deceived,' &c.

Not quite so fast, my good friend. With your leave, this is not all there is in 'Reason No. Five,'—no, nor any portion of it, if you dis sever it,—as you do—from its proper connection in my Review. Look at that Review again, and see your huge mistake. I intimated plainly enough, that the letter, as well as the resolutions of the Convention that accompanied it, in the publication of the proceedings, might be so construed that I could 'readily agree with the sentiment.' But I proceeded to tell why, as coming from you, I was obliged to construe your letter in the light of some portions of your famous third 'Discourse on the Religion of Reason,' a paragraph of which I proceeded to copy.—All this you wholly ignore, and give the extracts from your Syracuse letter alone, as containing 'all there is in Reason No. Five.'—You do not disclaim the identity of meaning, supposed by me in the two documents, yet virtually, you deny that I could, in my own mind, have construed the latter utterance in the light of the former one. Or rather, you ignore the existence of the former one, as an element in 'Reason No. Five' altogether, and even the existence of the paragraph, quoted by me from your 'Religion of Reason.'

I cannot dwell longer on this matter, in this letter, but must reserve it for another.

I do not like to close, however, without noticing, briefly, some other things contained in your letter.

1. You say you deserve the more credit and honor, not the less, for laboring and giving, in the enterprise of political action, while in a state of discouragement. I willingly accord to you all that can fairly be claimed by or for you, on that score. I should not grudge to award you all you have claimed or even more. I have admired, and do still admire, your strength in the depths of despondency. I have intended to say nothing, and I think I have said nothing in disparagement of your labors and appropriations. I should be the last of your friends to see injustice done you in this matter. But that does not do away the mischiefs of your discouragement, nor prove the wisdom of your appointment to a fact, that, of necessity, diffuses your discouragement, through your letters and speeches, throughout all the ranks of those who regard you their leader. What would you say of an invading army, that should elect as their General, one who had just said to them, 'Fellow soldiers! You see the enemy's fortress yonder. I have little or no hope that you can ever get possession of it. I would not advise you to lay in a large store of ammunition. But I shall not be sorry to learn that you do not partake of my discouragement. I shall be ready to co-operate with you upon any scale of effort that you may adopt.' Would you think that such an army was, or could be much in advance of their chosen leader, in their expectations? Or that it could be in a position to improve any real advantages of its position?

2. You say of me, that my lips and pen have long been employed in soliciting votes for you. True. But I have met with very little success in my labors. And wherefore? The hundreds upon hundreds of responses to my appeals verbally and by letter, from every part of the Free States, tell the reason.—'Gerrit Smith has little or no faith in the success of your Liberty Party, and why should we have? If we can't get what we want, we must take up with what we can get.' 'Gerrit Smith speaks well of Van Buren.' 'Ger-



rit Smith is waiting to see whether he cannot vote for Hale.' 'Gerrit Smith says Fremont is a good anti-slavery man.' Frederick Douglass was but one among thousands, who said they went to Fremont, because they believed Gerrit Smith desired them to do so.

My 'pen and lips,' in the meantime, were working incessantly, to get votes for you.—Sometime afterward, I learned, to my mortification, from your own lips, on a public occasion, that from the time you saw the smallness of the Convention that nominated you, (and what marvel that it was small?) you took no interest in the nomination. Why then, thought I to myself, should I have taken so much interest in it? And now, let me ask you seriously, my old friend Gerrit Smith, do you think that you ought to expect of me, that, after such an experience, I should exhaust the flickering lamp of my life, in my old age, in the toilsome and bootless task, of using 'my pen and lips' any more, in this manner? Ought you to reproach me, because I decline doing so? Ought you to discredit the sincerity of my reasons? Ought you to allow your imagination to get the better of your sober judgment, and accustomed 'charity' and conjure up other reasons instead of them? Where are your old friends and supporters, John Thomas, Abram Pryne, Henry Catlin, and others like them, whom certainly you will not charge with any 'impatience with what they regard your religion?' Are they employing their 'pens and lips' to get votes for you? Or are they at work for Lincoln? Henry Catlin in his *Erie True American*, says that William Goodell's *Principia*, is the only remaining journal on the Radical Abolition platform. Why then is William Goodell singled out for your uncharitable suspicions? I have heard of no reproofs of Gerrit Smith for John Thomas, Abram Pryne, and Henry Catlin, who have deserted him to support Lincoln, which I have not done. I have not even heard from Gerrit Smith, any direct and explicit denial of the reiterated assertion of John Thomas in the *State League*, that Gerrit Smith himself, desires the election of Lincoln, while the statement, (as in 1856, respecting Fremont) is running the rounds of the Republican papers, in staring capitals. I do not forget your severe denunciation of those who vote for the Republican candidate, nor do I forget that we had them also in 1856, alternating with your commendations of Fremont, to the bewilderment and perplexity of your friends.

You speak of my having 'warned' others not to vote for you. I have only stated, as my position as Editor required me to state, frankly, that I could not vote for you. And I was obliged, of course, to give the reasons. And now you compel me to vindicate the sincerity and truthfulness of my reasons. Beyond this I have no intention of going. I have neither time, space, strength or desire, to enter into a political warfare with Gerrit Smith. I wish to leave all abolitionists to act in accordance with their own conviction, as I have done, and intend to do.

4. As to your charging upon 'Orthodoxy,' the blame of dividing the Liberty Party, by its high demands and by setting up a theological test in politics, my Review will show to the attentive reader, that if the Liberty Party is to be theologically divided, the high demand and the theological tests will have come from the *anti* orthodox side. This I think I shall make too evident to admit of controversy, in my next letter. Your old friend,

WILLIAM GOODELL.

—The Woman's Library in New York is making rapid progress in public favor. Classes in French, German, book keeping, drawing &c., will be commenced this winter, and the fee for entrance will be small. The terms of subscription are \$1 a year, but the rule is not insisted on in cases where its exaction would deprive any poor, but intelligent girl of the advantages to be derived from good reading.

—A Believerett man, of Uniontown, Ala., has been flogged for declaring that in case of disunion he would shoulder his musket, go North, and fight against the South.

## CHRISTIANITY AND COLOR.

BY HORACE GREELEY.

There are in the State of New York some fifty or sixty thousand persons wholly or partially of negro blood; in all the Free States, perhaps five times that number. As the Christianity of our day, even the worst of it, recognizes these despised Pariahs as having souls to be saved or lost, it is not necessary to convince it that they are human beings—a portion of that great family of man which, our Declaration of Independence asserts, God has created equal, and endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

These blacks are not an attractive, as they are not a favorite class. They have great faults, as all degraded, down-trodden tribes or races have, and always have had. What Israelite of any age would be likely to regard with complacency an account, by one of Pharaoh's historiographers, of the descendants of Jacob as they dwelt in the land of Goshen in the earlier prime of Moses?

The blacks among us are often vicious, indolent, dissipated, as too many whites are likewise, without half their excuse. The blacks are too generally ignorant: what have been and are their opportunities for learning? They are vicious: but how deficient their inducements to virtue compared with those of whites? They are grovelling in their tastes and appetites: what is their incitement to nobleness and self-denying effort? Let him do his best, and let that be the equal of any man's best, and what can the negro achieve? The world is full of discontented, unhappy, despondent whites; but which of them, in the very agony of despair, ever wishes himself a Negro?

Can any Christian seriously doubt that, if Jesus of Nazareth were this day on earth, and New York his abiding-place, he would regard with indignation the treatment of this crushed caste—its rigorous exclusion alike from fashionable churches and from fashionable hotels, save in some attitude which bespeaks their despised condition? Suppose the Savior of mankind should, by some miraculous interposition, be permitted to preach in Grace church or Trinity, and should there see notorious libertines in the social and swindlers in the commercial world occupying seats of honor, while humble saints, guilty of a dark skin, were either shut out or rigidly confined to the 'negro pew,' would not that arrangement be likely to find a place among the topics of his discourse?

But the Christ of the poor and the lowly does not preach, and is seldom preached in such costly and sumptuous edifices—had He done so, it could not have taken John Jay ten years of steady, resolute struggle to secure to the single congregation of colored Episcopalians in this city its clear constitutional right to be represented in the Diocesan Convention. Only in spirit, and in the universal applicability of the great, universal truths He uttered while on earth, does He now say to the oppressor and his parasites, the advocate of man's inalienable rights and his backers, 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my disciples, ye did it unto me.' Let us consider, then, in the light of eternal principle, the present attitude of the organized, embodied Christianity of New York toward the people of color providentially among us.

There are in this city some three hundred Christian churches, while from its presses hardly less than twenty professedly Christian periodicals are steadily issued. Those churches those periodicals, necessarily exert a very great influence over the opinions, the acts of perhaps one million voters. A large proportion of those voters are called to vote in November directly on the question, 'Shall black men in this State hold and enjoy the right of suffrage on the same terms with white men? or shall they alone be denied a voice in making and modifying the laws which they must obey, and in choosing the rulers by whom those laws are to be enforced?' Can there

be any serious doubt as to which is the essentially CHRISTIAN side to this controversy?

A black who transgresses any law of the State of New York is held to at least as rigorous account for that transgression as tho' he were white. Let him steal, or forge, or maim, and a white magistrate will speedily issue a warrant for his arrest, a white policeman or deputy sheriff arrest him, a white prosecutor arraign him, a white judge try him, a white jury find him guilty, and a white turnkey lock him up and set him at work for the State. Whether he have or have not rights which white men are bound to respect, he will be most impressively taught that *they* have rights, and that he cannot help respecting them. For all purposes of responsibility to law and punishment for violating it, he is regarded as a rational, capable, responsible human being: why not for correlative responsibilities and privileges of citizenship as well?

But the case is too plain for argument.—The disfranchised class are so disfranchised not because they are ignorant, or vicious, or in any manner incompetent, but because they are black. 'To this complexion' the whole matter inevitably comes at last. An irreclaimable loafer, an incorrigibly drunken vagabond, a habitual rowdy and law-defyer, and ten thousand keepers of policy offices, brothels, and gambling-houses and grog shops—all these, if white, as they mostly are—are unquestioned voters: while the most exemplary Christian, if at once poor and black, is disfranchised. And a great majority of the Christian churches, the Christian periodicals, the Christian professors of our city, raise no voice in remonstrance against this flagrant injustice and wrong!

At our ensuing election, those Christians who believe that the Golden Rule applies as clearly and searchingly to voting as to ruling, trading, or any other exercise of our volition whereby our neighbors are or may be seriously affected, are required to vote for or against abolishing the Property Qualification now exacted in our State of black men. Is it not desirable and requisite that every Christian should bestir himself in favor of Equal Suffrage, and should endeavor to enlist his neighbors and his brethren in the church actively in favor of the same righteous decision?

## NEGRO INSURRECTION.

The slave insurrection panic seems to be fast growing among our Southern brethren into a chronic disorder. It does not indeed affect at the same time all parts of the country; it may rather be compared in its operations to the neuralgia, tormenting the unhappy patients now here, now there, now in the head, now in the foot, sometimes in the heart, darting suddenly, with its sharp twinging pains, from one extremity of the slaveholding body to the other, but scarcely for a moment ceasing to torment it somewhere. The paroxysm of this ugly disorder by which Texas was lately visited, resulted in the hanging of a Methodist minister or two, the beating, tarring and feathering, and expulsion from the State, of sundry white men, and the summary murder of a number of negroes, has now suddenly transferred itself to Norfolk, Virginia. The most remarkable effect of a twinge of this unfortunate complaint in its disturbing operation upon the mind, seeming to extinguish for the moment, in those individuals affected by it, all judgment and common sense, and exposing them to be frightened out of their wits by the most ridiculous and improbable stories.—Such was the case in Texas—the story there being that the negroes had provided themselves with an unlimited quantity of strychnine, with which they were to poison all the wells, and thus exterminate the white population.—The story by which the City of Norfolk, and the neighboring rural districts, are now consternated, is of about equal common sense and probability. We are assured that a plan of operations has been maturing ever since last Spring, it being shrewdly surmised that the mad fanatics who originated it had some design on Gov. Wise and his family, on account of the firm and decided stand he took in the



capture and execution of John Brown. One Dick Ryan, a free negro, had, it is alleged, written to the North and engaged the services of parties who were just about this time to arrive at Norfolk or Old Point in a vessel, with arms and men, to assist in liberating the slaves. The story is said to rest on the confession of another free negro, arrested on suspicion. Fortunately, however, for Governor Wise and the Norfolk slaveholders, the plot has been discovered in time. Four as respectable gentlemen as can be found in Norfolk County, upon the strength of this alarming information, addressed a letter to Mayor Lamb of the City of Norfolk—so the *Norfolk Day Book* assures us—and that most efficient magistrate, being thus forewarned, will 'take the necessary steps to develop the scheme,' and to arrest the vessel, should it arrive. Thanks to the four respectable gentlemen of Norfolk, the vigilance and promptitude of Mayor Lamb, the valor and energy of Gov. Wise, who is a resident in the neighborhood, and, more than all, to the seasonable confession of Dick Ryan, the free negro, Norfolk, it is hoped, may escape the visitation of the vessel from the North, with arms and men, and the consequent freeing of the negroes and murder of the whites. Meanwhile, however, the neighboring rural districts are in a high state of alarm and excitement. Confessions are being extorted from the negroes by the free application of the lash, and the slaves on several plantations have taken fright at the excitement prevailing about them, and have fled to the woods.

Of course, a paroxysm of this sort could not pass without a few murders. The patrol of Norfolk County have shot dead a white man, an Irishman, apparently, one of a party engaged in ditching, because he fled when they approached the tent in which he and his fellow laborers were camping out. A free negro had also been shot while running away from some gentlemen who were endeavoring to arrest him for some 'incendious expression' he had used. A number of negroes are in jail at Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Princess Anne, and hot pursuit is being made after the redoubtable Dick Ryan himself. His capture might unravel the whole mystery, but it is apprehended that, according to the Southern method of investigating these insurrection plots, he will be shot down before anything can be got out of him.

Even the most ardent admirers of the Slave labor system must admit that these Slave insurrection panics are somewhat of a drawback on its felicities. Who would like to live in a community which any knave or any fool may throw at any time into a paroxysm of bloody terror, and where the public peace is at the mercy of every free negro or white vagabond who drops an ambiguous expression, or any negro who, under the application of the lash, repeats a confession dictated to him?—*N. Y. Tribune*.

#### JERRY RESCUE CELEBRATION.

The following are the Resolutions which were adopted at the Jerry Rescue Celebration, held at Syracuse, Oct. 1st:

*Resolved*, That the Act which on this, its anniversary day, we celebrate, the Rescue of Jerry, was an emphatic, signal affirmation of the truths of justice and the rights of man, rights so primal, that they derive not their birth from any social arrangement or political compact among men, but inhere and reside originally, by divine ordination, in the human constitution, so substantial, real, and inextinguishable, that they cannot be altered or annulled by any enactment, but remain sovereign and sacred, to be honored everywhere, and in case of attempted violation, to be maintained, as above and before all covenants, statutes and formal constitutions whatsoever.

*Resolved*, That in spirit and principle, this Act was a pointed condemnation of slavery in its every assumption, as a thing essentially absurd, wicked and monstrous—a falsehood too glaring and malignant to receive a single moment's assent—a crime, too gross and out-

rageous to be in any case endured—an atrocity, incapable, through whatever device, of any transformation in character or baptism into respectability, and meriting, at all times and under all circumstances, to be sternly denied, resisted, broken down, and trampled under foot.

*Resolved*, That in spirit and principle, this Act was also a condemnation of all complicity with slavery, all participation, directly or indirectly, in the guilt, and it stands a perpetual admonition and rebuke to all who, however active in executing or loud in applauding the Rescue of Jerry, do yet give their suffrage and support to parties and platforms and candidates that ignore the slave, and stand pledged to the slaveholder for the maintenance to him inviolate of his 'domestic institution,' and avowedly committed to the shameful work of hunting down and remanding back to the horrors of slavery the flying bondman.

*Resolved*, That we deeply rejoice in those other Slave Rescues which have in different parts of our country successively followed this of Jerry—the rescue at Milwaukee, at Wellington, and at Troy—and we hold in all honor the brave men and women who have been guilty of these acts of humanity, and hereby tender them our warmest sympathies in all those persecutions and sufferings to which for this sake they may be subjected.

*Resolved*, That we hear with unalloyed satisfaction of the rescue of that faithful rescuer, Sherman M. Booth, from the hands of the United States authorities at Milwaukee, and of the spirit evinced by his fellow citizens to protect him from official re-seizure;—and we hereby exhort the people of Wisconsin, that they suffer neither him nor his rescuers to be victimized by this conspiratorial, slave-hunting government, but that they stand by and for them, in every extremity and at all hazards, holding themselves ready, should occasion arise, promptly to rescue them also in turn.

*Resolved*, That we utterly repudiate and renounce and put under our feet all Fugitive Slave laws, so called, whether of '93 or of '50, as inherently unjust, inhuman and atrociously wicked, whose mandates it were treason to obey, and loyalty to resist; and we hereby pledge ourselves henceforth steadily to oppose and decisively to thwart all attempted executions of them on this our soil—nay, to exert ourselves unceasingly until they become objects of universal reprobation and abhorrence, to be everywhere indignantly disowned, and in repentance and shame to be instantly wiped from the statute book of the nation.

*Resolved*, That the morbid sensitiveness, the apprehension and dread habitually exhibited throughout the South, the paroxysm of fright and terror that seized at the moment of the appearance of John Brown with his little band of intrepid rescuers at Harper's Ferry, the acts of ruthless violence, outrage and atrocity that followed each other in quick succession over all those States, and are not yet terminated, attest the felt guilt, the fearful exposures and perils of slavery; and that all the signs in this sky, the real or imagined insurrections, the wild panics and reckless, unbridled excesses of late constantly occurring, portend the swift downfall that awaits, and proclaim in omens not to be mistaken, that slavery must be abolished, or the enslaver must perish.

*Resolved*, That from all considerations therefore, whether of justice or of expediency, if indeed there were an expediency apart from justice, out of regard to the sacred rights of the slave, and regard to the imperilled condition of the slaveholder, we feel impelled to urge anew and with fresh emphasis, immediate and unconditional emancipation, always a duty, and now become a stern, instant necessity; and we hereby covenant with each other steadfastly to work to this end, seeking its accomplishment by all just methods, without cessation, and without compromise.

—An account of the Seventh Annual Clam Bake will appear in our next number.

#### THE 'FREE NEGRO' IN MARYLAND.

On the 6th of November next, the day of the Presidential election, the voters of Baltimore, St. Mary's, Calvert, Howard, Kent, Worcester, Somerset, Talbot, Queen Anne's, Prince George's and Charles Counties will be called upon to express their sentiments on the enactment of the Legislature, known as the 'Free Negro Law,' which provides for the control and management of the free colored population inhabiting the same. We give below a synopsis of the law:

Sec. 1st provides that the commissioners of the counties named shall appoint three commissioners in each election district, to control and manage the free colored population.

2. The commissioners meet on the 1st of December, and adjourn from day to day, or to any named day.

3. The constables of the districts to bring all the free negroes of the district before the commissioners.

4. That the negroes shall then be notified that unless they shall hire themselves to some industrious and respectable citizen by the year, they shall be sold at public sale to the highest bidder for the term of one year.

5. That if the negroes do not produce before the 1st of January a note or bond, as evidence that they have hired for the year, on that day they are to be exposed to public sale to the highest bidder.

6. All children of free negroes, between the age of 4 and 12, shall be indentured to some citizen; males until they are 21; and females until they are 30.

7. The issues of said hired or bound females to be bound on in like manner.

8. A negro hired or bound under the provisions of this act, that shall 'refuse to serve faithfully,' or run away, shall be sold for life, the proceeds to go into the public school fund.

9. A fund shall be provided for the support of old and disabled negroes, and for females and their children who may be unable to hire, the said fund to be raised from the wages of those who shall hire themselves, as well as from the wages of those the commissioners hire.

10. The commissioners shall collect all the money due to negroes for their labor, and deduct therefrom 'all the expenditures attending the operation of this act, including attorney's and clerk's fees, constables', auctioneer's and commissioner's charges,' and the amount necessary to support those incapable of being hired or bound under the provisions of this act, and the balance shall be distributed among the free negroes, 'in the judgment and discretion' of the county commissioners.

11. The name, age and sex of the free negroes to be recorded.

12, 13 and 14 provide for the fees to be paid to constables, auctioneers, state's attorneys and clerks.

15. The District Commissioners to be allowed each two dollars per day for each day employed, not to exceed thirty days each year.

16. Negroes possessed in their own right of \$150 of assessed property to be exempt from the provisions of the law, and \$50 additional assessed property for each child will exempt such children from the provisions thereof.

17. The law to be accepted or rejected at the Presidential election.

18. Sheriffs of the counties shall give notice of the same.

19. Judges and clerks of election to make returns, &c.

20 names the counties included.

—A well-dressed young man chancing to come upon a wharf in Philadelphia, last week, where a crowd were lamenting the fall of a boy into the water, but doing nothing to rescue him, threw off his coat and plunged in and brought him to shore. Discovering that the boy was a negro, he exclaimed, "Is that all I have saved? I would not have gone over for the d-d nigger." The admiration which the crowd felt for his heroism was completely extinguished.

—Yancey has been invited to address the working men of Boston upon the influence of slave labor upon white labor, where the two systems are brought into competition with each other.



[For Douglass' Monthly.]  
**THE SACRIFICE.**  
**'UP! FOR IT IS TIME.'**

BY GEORGE W. PUTNAM.

'Twas eighteen fifty-nine, in cold December,  
 'Neath a clear, wintry sky,  
 The day and hour the world will e'er remember,  
 JOHN BROWN came forth to die!

With a calm smile he greets the fierce eyes  
 scowling,  
 Adown the lengthened line,  
 And Slavery's ravening wolf pack hush their  
 howling  
 Beneath his look divine!

'Whence is this strength? He stands before the  
 scaffold,  
 Yet trembles not a limb!  
 So asked the tyrants, as with malice baffled  
 They wondering gazed on him!

This wise—all night, heeding no sentry's warning,  
 Came to his cell that throng;  
 The same which, in Gethsemane one morning,  
 Made a lone spirit strong.

See! from the cliffs which guard the starry  
 regions  
 Myriads of eyes look down!  
 And from the pearly gates pour the bright  
 legions,  
 Bearing the martyr's crown!

And hovering near him many a wing of angel  
 Gleams in the amber light!  
 Thou'lt hear, old man, to-day the Christ's evangel,  
 And walk with him in white!

He pauses at the gallows' stair—caressing,  
 With voice and features mild,  
 The outcast ones—gives them his latest blessing,  
 Kisses the negro child.

Great God! that kiss!—its thrilling hath not  
 perished,  
 But on from clime to clime,  
 Leaping from heart to heart, it shall be cherished  
 Till the last pulse of Time!

From the high platform he sees strange lights  
 looming  
 Far up the northern sky!  
 Hears on the wintry breeze the sullen booming  
 Of minute guns surge by!

He knows it all!—that million hearts are bleed-  
 ing  
 In this dark hour for him;  
 And trembling lips in vast assemblies reading—  
 Words that through tears grow dim!

He scans the future with a faith unshaken,  
 The Battle he begun—  
 He knows stops not—good work well undertaken,  
 In due time *must* be done!

His mind on fire with Truth, in its vast reachings  
 A deeper law had seen  
 Than that expressed in the o'er-loving teachings  
 Of the good Nazarene.

That deeper LAW of NATURE, full of beauty!  
 The GODHEAD's brightest crown;  
 JUSTICE TO ALL! and hence the right and duty  
 To crush the tyrant down!

For this to-day, beneath the light supernal,  
 Thou, mighty one! shalt stand;  
 And JUSTICE, from the heart of the Eternal,  
 Shall bless thy red right hand!

One moment now to fill his glory's measure—  
 The silver cord is riven!  
 The lofty spirit sweeps the sea of azure!  
 The martyr is in Heaven!

Bell answers bell; and cannon's voice terrific,  
 The boding sounds of woe;  
 From the Atlantic to the broad Pacific  
 Upon the breezes go!

Twice since that Gay Virginia hath lifted  
 Her gibbet, dark and grim,  
 And there the young, the brave, the true, the  
 gifted,  
 Worthily followed him.

And round the rolling world, with deep emotion,  
 The Peoples tell the story,  
 Remembering all their courage and devotion,  
 They keep their names in glory!

Nor ends it here—e'en now the night fires glaring  
 Light up the robber land;  
 And houseless tyrants know the Negro's daring,  
 And feel his heavy hand!

The cold steel in the twinkling star-light glistens  
 Beside the sleeper's bed;

All night the waking mother trembles and listens  
 To hear the Avenger's tread!

AND THEY SHALL HEAR IT! e'er the record closes  
 That which hath been, shall be  
 The trampled millions with another Moses  
 Shall walk the crimson sea!

Whilst we refine—making the clear yet clearer,  
 Prating of Tones and Laws;  
 God sleepeth not! but nearer still and nearer  
 His fiery circle draws!

The cry that rang so wildly through the Tyrol,  
 When the *sign* rode the waters!  
 At its fierce coming, maidens cease your carol,  
 Woe! to the South-land's daughters!

The cry of Andrew Hofer through the mountains,  
 Shall fill this land of crime!  
 And cheeks grow pale beside the southern foun-  
 tains—  
 UP NOW! FOR IT IS TIME!

#### ADVERTISEMENTS.

ROCHESTER COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE  
 N. W. BENEDICT AND L. R. SATERLEE,  
 PRINCIPALS,  
 Rochester, Monroe County, N. Y.

THIS INSTITUTION offers the superior  
 advantages of a Model School, systematic  
 and thorough in every department.

With a complete Academic and Collegiate  
 course of study, it combines, under the best Ar-  
 tists and Teachers that can be procured, instruc-  
 tion in Painting, Drawing, Vocal and Instrumental  
 Music.

The city and its schools have special and pecu-  
 liar advantages for the attainment of all the  
 graceful accomplishments, and superior social  
 culture. Such facilities it is the earnest aim of  
 this Institution to furnish.

The new Boarding Hall, in charge of one of  
 the Principals, is devoted exclusively to the ac-  
 commodation of young ladies from abroad. The  
 number of boarders is limited to forty. The  
 rooms, designed for two occupants, are neatly  
 furnished, warmed, and lighted by gas. Expens-  
 es are moderate. Those interested should  
 make immediate application to one of the Prin-  
 cipals.

Fall Term commences Monday, Sept 3d, 1860.  
 Circulars, giving additional information, sent  
 on application. Rochester, July, 1860.

SERMONS AND OTHER DISCOURSES.—  
 WITH BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL HINTS. By  
 BENJAMIN GREEN. Pages 558, 12mo. With  
 Portrait engraved by Ritchie.

'In spite of the modest and to most read-  
 ers, perhaps uncompromising, title of this vol-  
 ume, it will be found to bear the impress of a  
 vigorous and original mind and to contain a  
 fund of earnest thought, profound feeling, and  
 eloquent expression. The topics mostly relate  
 to the great practical interests of life, the appli-  
 cation of the highest principle to daily affairs,  
 and the influence of Christianity on politics,  
 business, education, and the general relations  
 of society. With a strong faith in the vitality  
 of justice, Mr. Green contends strenuously  
 against every form of oppression, insisting on  
 the exact adjustment of social duties by the  
 standard of ideal right. His powerful reason-  
 ing is always accompanied with novel and sug-  
 gestive illustrations, showing no less felicity of  
 statement than sincerity of conviction. No one  
 can peruse the volume without respecting the  
 zeal and integrity of the author, and receiving  
 a new impression of the worth of the principles  
 to which his labors have been devoted.'—[New  
 York Tribune, 29th Sept.]

'One thought pervades throughout—that of  
 the absolute supremacy, the all sovereign au-  
 thority of the Throne of the Eternal, of great  
 Truth and Justice. They are the life of the  
 world, the soul and substance of whatever has  
 vitality, worth, permanence among men. Here  
 is wisdom and strength, the secret spring of all  
 accomplishment and success. Fidelity is  
 achievement, and unfaithfulness is failure and  
 defeat. The ideal is the standard, to which ev-  
 ery thing must be carefully adjusted. All  
 usages and institutions are tried in this light,  
 and each to be accepted as good and worthy  
 only as it may conform to and symbolize the  
 inner Verities. There is warm appreciation of  
 heroism in life, and especially high adoration of  
 Jesus as "the Hero of all Heroes," realization  
 utmost of the perfections of wisdom, virtue and  
 nobleness in history. And there is correspond-  
 ingly deep disgust and abhorrence of all base-  
 ness. He has indignant loathing and abomina-  
 tion for those wretched idols before whom the  
 multitudes bow down and worship—those cun-

ning, soulless quacks and jugglers who, vaulting  
 up perpetually into the high places of society,  
 busy themselves but to bewitch and bewilder,  
 to behold and destroy.'—[Review in N. A. S.  
 Standard, 22d September.]

Price.....\$1.25  
 When pre-paid by mail..... 1.46

S. W. GREEN, 16 Jacob Street,  
 [Nov-4t\*] or Box 3159, New York,  
 or of the author, Whitesboro', N. Y.

GERRIT SMITH: RELIGION OF  
 REASON. No. 4. THE ONE TEST OF CHAR-  
 ACTER, 'Wherefore by their Fruits ye shall know  
 them.' Now Ready. Price, Five Cents. For  
 sale by ROSS & TOUSEY,  
 [Nov-3t\*] 121 Nassau St., New York.

#### DIED:

DUPLEX—In Danby, Tompkins Co., N. Y., on  
 the 13th of September last, after a protracted ill-  
 ness, Mr. GEORGE DUPLEX, in the 79th year of his  
 age.

The deceased was born at Southington,  
 Conn., where his father was formerly held as a  
 slave, but became free in consequence of effi-  
 cient and active services rendered in the Revo-  
 lutionary war. His mother never having been  
 a slave, of course he never participated person-  
 ally in the special blessings of the 'patriarchal  
 institution.'

He came to reside in Danby as early as the  
 year 1811, and by dint of industry and econ-  
 omy, soon procured a competence of this  
 world's goods; and in consequence of his strict  
 integrity and high moral worth, he maintained,  
 to the day of his death, an enviable place in  
 the esteem of all who knew him.

He was a consistent and constant friend of  
 his brethren in bonds, and was always ready to  
 give freely of his goods to promote the cause of  
 the oppressed. When the old Liberty Party  
 was first formed, he at once identified himself  
 with it; and amid all the defections of those  
 around him, he remained true to the holy cause  
 of freedom. He possessed a rare and strong in-  
 tellect, such as would have qualified him for  
 positions of trust and honor.

His death was one of Christian resignation  
 and holy triumph. His remains were followed  
 to the grave by a large concourse of sympathiz-  
 ing friends, and the occasion was improved by  
 an appropriate discourse from the Rev. S. Ott-  
 man, late pastor of the Presbyterian Church in  
 Danby, based on that passage of Scripture in  
 the Book of Job, 3: 17, 19—'There the wicked  
 cease from troubling, and there the weary be at  
 rest. There the prisoners rest together; they  
 hear not the voice of the oppressor. The small  
 and the great are there; and the servant is free  
 from his master.'

A. Y.  
 RUFF—In Mount Vernon, Iowa, on the 3d of  
 September, Mrs. SARAH RUFF, formerly Miss  
 Davidson.

The deceased will be affectionately remem-  
 bered in Southern Illinois, where she taught.—  
 She was a worthy member of the Covenanters'  
 Church in Mount Vernon, and respected and  
 beloved by all who knew her. She has left a  
 bereaved husband who mourns not as those  
 without hope, for as her life was consistent, her  
 dying hour was happy. She also leaves an in-  
 teresting little boy about three years of age.

MINERVA F. HOES.

#### TERMS OF DOUGLASS' MONTHLY.

Single Copies, to American subscribers, \$1 per year.  
 " " to British " 5s. sterling.

Subscriptions must be paid for *invariably in advance*.  
 All communications, whether on business or for publi-  
 cation, should be addressed to

FREDERICK DOUGLASS, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

#### AGENTS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

We take the liberty of using the names of the follow-  
 ing gentlemen who will receive names and subscriptions  
 for *Douglass' Monthly* in Great Britain:

Halifax—Rev. RUSSELL LANT CARPENTER, Milton  
 Place; Rev. Dr. CROFTS, North Parade.

London—Mr. L. A. CAMEROVZOW, Anti-Slavery Office,  
 27, New Broad Street, E. C.

Dublin—Mr. WM. WEBB, 52, High Street, and 8, Dun-  
 ville Avenue, Rathmines.

Derby—Dr. SPENCER T. HALL, Burton Road.

Glasgow—Mr. JOHN SMITH, 173, Trongate.

Leeds—Mr. ARTHUR HOLLAND, 4, Park Row.

Newcastle-on-Tyne—Mr. WALTER S. PRINGLE.

—The Rochester Ladies' Anti-Slavery So-  
 ciety gratefully acknowledge the receipt of £4  
 from the Dalkeith Ladies' A. S. Society, and £1  
 14s. from the Mansfield L. A. S. Society.

MARIA G. PORTER, Treasurer.